

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 3, 1994

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Rabbi Israel Poleyeff, Hebrew Academy of the Five Towns and Rockaway, Cedarhurst, NY, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we ask Thy blessings upon this distinguished legislative body, and we ask that You crown their deliberations with success. For more than two centuries our blessed and beloved country has been the haven for those fleeing tyranny and oppression. They came to these shores seeking a new life in the land of freedom and opportunity. Our Nation to this day remains a beacon of light to all people and an example to the nations of the world that life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are indeed the inalienable rights of all human beings.

The men and women gathered here are charged with the awesome responsibility of guiding our Nation along that path set forth by our Founding Fathers. Bless them with wisdom and understanding and compassion so that all the inhabitants of this land can look forward to the time when every person shall dwell safely, "each under his vine and his fig tree" in peace and security. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 153, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—250

Abercrombie	Andrews (ME)	Applegate
Ackerman	Andrews (NJ)	Bacchus (FL)

Baessler	Gutierrez	Orton
Barca	Hall (OH)	Oxley
Barcia	Hall (TX)	Pallone
Barlow	Hamburg	Parker
Barrett (WI)	Hamilton	Pastor
Barton	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Bateman	Hayes	Payne (VA)
Becerra	Hefner	Pelosi
Beilenson	Hinchey	Penny
Berman	Hoagland	Peterson (FL)
Bevill	Hochbrueckner	Peterson (MN)
Bilbray	Holden	Pickett
Bishop	Houghton	Pickle
Blackwell	Hoyer	Pombo
Borski	Hughes	Pomeroy
Boucher	Hutto	Porter
Brewster	Hyde	Poshard
Brooks	Inglis	Price (NC)
Browder	Insee	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Bryant	Johnson, E. B.	Reynolds
Byrne	Johnston	Richardson
Cantwell	Kanjorski	Roemer
Cardin	Kaptur	Rose
Carr	Kasich	Roybal-Allard
Chapman	Kennedy	Rush
Clayton	Kennelly	Sanders
Clement	Kildee	Sangmeister
Clinger	Kingston	Sarpallus
Clyburn	Kleczka	Sawyer
Coleman	Klein	Schenk
Collins (MI)	Klink	Schumer
Combest	Kopetski	Serrano
Condit	LaFalce	Sharp
Conyers	Lambert	Shepherd
Cooper	Lancaster	Sisisky
Coppersmith	Lantos	Skaggs
Costello	LaRocco	Skelton
Coyne	Laughlin	Slattery
Cramer	Lehman	Slaughter
Danner	Levin	Smith (IA)
Darden	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
Deal	Lipinski	Stark
DeFazio	Lloyd	Stenholm
DeLauro	Long	Stokes
Dellums	Lowey	Strickland
Derrick	Maloney	Studds
Deutsch	Mann	Stupak
Dicks	Manton	Swett
Dingell	Margolies-	Swift
Dixon	Mezvinisky	Synar
Dooley	Markey	Tanner
Durbin	Martinez	Tauzin
Edwards (CA)	Matsui	Tejeda
Edwards (TX)	Mazzoli	Thompson
Engel	McCloskey	Thornton
English	McCurdy	Thurman
Eshoo	McDermott	Torres
Evans	McHale	Torricelli
Everett	McKinney	Towns
Farr	McNulty	Traficant
Fazio	Meehan	Tucker
Fields (LA)	Meek	Unsoeld
Filner	Menendez	Valentine
Fingerhut	Mfume	Velazquez
Flake	Miller (CA)	Vento
Foglietta	Mineta	Visclosky
Ford (TN)	Minge	Volkmer
Frank (MA)	Mink	Waters
Frost	Moakley	Watt
Furse	Mollohan	Waxman
Gejdenson	Montgomery	Wheat
Gephardt	Murtha	Williams
Geren	Myers	Wilson
Gibbons	Nadler	Wise
Gillmor	Neal (MA)	Woolsey
Gilman	Neal (NC)	Wyden
Glickman	Oberstar	Wynn
Gonzalez	Obey	Yates
Gordon	Oliver	
Greenwood	Ortiz	

NAYS—153

Allard	Goss	Paxon
Armey	Grams	Petri
Bachus (AL)	Grandy	Portman
Baker (CA)	Gunderson	Pryce (OH)
Baker (LA)	Hancock	Quillen
Ballenger	Hastert	Quinn
Barrett (NE)	Hefley	Ramstad
Bartlett	Herger	Ravenel
Bentley	Hobson	Regula
Bereuter	Hoekstra	Ridge
Billakis	Hoke	Roberts
Bliley	Horn	Rogers
Blute	Huffington	Rohrabacher
Boehert	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Hutchinson	Roth
Bonilla	Inhofe	Roukema
Bunning	Istook	Royce
Burton	Jacobs	Santorum
Buyer	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Callahan	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer
Calvert	Kim	Schroeder
Camp	King	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Klug	Shaw
Castle	Knollenberg	Shays
Clay	Kolbe	Shuster
Coble	Kreidler	Skeen
Collins (GA)	Kyl	Smith (MI)
Cox	Lazio	Smith (NJ)
Crapo	Leach	Smith (OR)
Cunningham	Levy	Smith (TX)
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Snowe
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (FL)	Solomon
Dickey	Lightfoot	Spence
Doolittle	Linder	Stearns
Dornan	Machtley	Stump
Dreier	Manzullo	Sundquist
Duncan	McCandless	Talent
Dunn	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Ehlers	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	McKeon	Thomas (CA)
Ewing	McMillan	Thomas (WY)
Fawell	Meyers	Upton
Fowler	Mica	Vucanovich
Franks (CT)	Michel	Walker
Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Gallegly	Molinari	Weldon
Gekas	Moorhead	Wolf
Gilchrest	Morella	Young (AK)
Gingrich	Murphy	Young (FL)
Goodlatte	Nussle	Zeliff
Goodling	Packard	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—30

Andrews (TX)	Gallo	Moran
Archer	Green	Natcher
Bonior	Hansen	Owens
Brown (CA)	Hastings	Rostenkowski
Collins (IL)	Hilliard	Sabo
Crane	Jefferson	Schiff
de la Garza	Livingston	Scott
Fields (TX)	McCrery	Torkildsen
Fish	McDade	Washington
Ford (MI)	McInnis	Whitten

□ 1130

Mr. QUINN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DARDEN). The Chair will ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1804) "An Act to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform; to promote the research, consensus building, and systemic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all American students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all Federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certifications; and for other purposes," agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. SIMON, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. WOFFORD, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. COATS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. DURENBERGER, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1560. An act to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency, and for other purposes.

WELCOME, RABBI ISRAEL POLEYEFF

(Mr. LEVY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank today's guest chaplain, Rabbi Israel Poleyeff, for offering a moving and inspirational opening prayer.

Rabbi Poleyeff is a teacher at the Hebrew Academy of the Five Towns and Rockaway, which is located in the district I represent. He is joined today by several of his students in the House gallery who have braved the elements to tour our Capital and see their teacher speak on the House floor.

Rabbi Poleyeff has served his country as an Army chaplain and has offered counsel and guidance to congregants in Pennsylvania and New York. He has been teaching at the Hebrew Academy since 1975.

I am grateful to have such an outstanding spiritual leader from my district open a session of the House of Representatives and I want to thank

Speaker FOLEY for allowing me to bring Rabbi Poleyeff here today.

Thank you, Rabbi Poleyeff, and the students of the Hebrew Academy for joining us.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. NATCHER

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since his election on August 1, 1953, the gentleman from Kentucky, WILLIAM H. NATCHER, has not responded to a rollcall vote. It would have been his 18,402d consecutive vote, the vote we just took on approving the Journal.

I was advised today that after consultation with his physicians he reluctantly determined that he would remain at Bethesda Naval Hospital and, consequently, not respond to this or other rollcall votes today.

Obviously, this is a sad moment for all of us because of the unparalleled public service of Mr. NATCHER. He will have in the record of 18,401 rollcall votes a record that I believe will stand forever.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you may be watching this session of the House and understand that behind that standing ovation of Members of the House from both sides of the aisle, from every part of this country, goes our enormous respect and admiration for you.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read your own words as given today:

After consultation with my physicians this morning, I have very reluctantly decided to remain at Bethesda Naval Hospital for continued treatment, and I will not be able to return to Capitol Hill today.

I want to thank the people of the Second Congressional District of Kentucky and the Commonwealth of Kentucky for all of their support and for their prayers and concern.

I served as Federal conciliation commissioner in 1936 and 1937 for the Western District of Kentucky, was then elected as county attorney of Warren County for three 4-year terms, and then was elected as commonwealth attorney in 1951 and served until I was elected to the Congress on August 1, 1953. Throughout my entire public service, I have never missed a single day of work, and during my tenure as a Member of Congress, I never missed a day or a vote. Through yesterday, Wednesday, March 2, 1994, the total of 18,401. I could not do this again, but I will try because I believe Members of Congress should vote.

The Second Congressional District of Kentucky has been good to me. I have enjoyed every day of my service, not only as a Member, but also as the chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, and as the chairman of the Full Committee on Appropriations.

I am extremely proud that last year, after being elected chairman of the full committee, with the cooperation of all of the Members and the staff, I was able to see to it that

all 13 appropriations bills were enacted on time, without an extended continuing resolution.

I will remain at the hospital and will be consulting with my physicians about my return to work.

Mr. Chairman, everyone in this Chamber hopes that the day will come soon when you can return to us, to your distinguished work and to this House. In the meantime, our prayers and thoughts are with you. God bless you, sir.

FURTHER TRIBUTE TO HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all that I want to thank the Speaker for the way in which he briefed the House and briefed the country today. I think it is an important part of this institution to remind people how human it is. I think every heart here goes out to Chairman NATCHER, and I appreciate very much the Speaker's bringing it to our attention.

I just want to say on behalf of Mr. MICHEL and the Republican leadership that we join with what the Speaker said and that we want Mr. NATCHER to know that across this House and, I think, frankly, this land, as people in recent weeks have watched the courage and the commitment of Mr. NATCHER, that the people are praying for him and care about him and that all of us look forward very fondly to the day when he can come back and join us. And I thank the Speaker for bringing that to our attention.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

FURTHER TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. NATCHER

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I can add very little to what our Speaker has said a moment ago about our colleague and friend, BILL NATCHER. But to put it in perspective, I have had the honor and rare privilege of serving with him for the past 24 years. It has been from my observation of him as a person and as a professional that when we think of BILL NATCHER, we think of the term estimable, we think of the terms devoted, dedicated, all these terms we know are part and parcel of public service.

Congressman NATCHER, my good friend from the Second District, has exemplified all of those cardinal virtues of public service throughout his entire career here in the House.

As the Speaker has said, this marks a day in which for the first time in those

40-plus years the chairman has been unable to cast a vote.

□ 1140

It does not mark the end of his service, however. It does mean that he is taking a momentary pause to try to recover his health at Bethesda Hospital, and we do join the Speaker and the minority side, all the sides, in extending our prayers to him for a full and a swift recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I think that while we will cast many votes in our careers and while we will represent our communities in the best way we can see fit to do, that there will be very few among us who will reach that pinnacle, who will become a true icon of public service, and I think that is exactly how the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has proceeded, to become an icon of this place.

So, Mr. Speaker, all of us in the Kentucky delegation join in extending our best wishes to BILL in the hopes that he take a good rest and recover his strength.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAZZOLI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just briefly that I was here when the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] came, when he was sworn in, and he has been a gracious and distinguished Member since that very day, been courteous to everybody, fair to everybody, and well respected by spouses. In fact, Mr. Speaker, my wife said this morning that she wanted me, if I saw BILL NATCHER, to tell him that we still loved him.

Now that is the kind of impact he made on people.

Now I want to give my colleagues one bit of other information:

While he was probably the most distinguished Presiding Officer that we had, other than our elected Speakers, he did confide in me one day that having a perfect record was probably the worst mistake he ever made, and I fully agree because I do not have a perfect voting record. I have missed several quorums, four or five Journal votes, and every now and then I believe I missed other votes that were not critical.

So I just want to say to my colleagues, "I warn you. Don't think you can emulate this because it's not a good deal, and he would have told you, and probably would still tell you, that trying to have a perfect record is almost impossible and a tremendous burden on yourself."

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate being able to yield a brief moment to my friend from the First District, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARLOW].

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to be in the House working with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. He has just missed one vote. He has other votes ahead of him. He is a fighter. We Kentuckians are fighters. He is fighting to restore his health.

Across America, Mr. Speaker, prayers are with him. I do believe the Lord has prepared the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] to lead us as a House on both sides of the aisle as we come into this period when we are restoring financial strength to our Nation. God bless him. Our prayers are with him.

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAZZOLI. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BAESLER], my colleague.

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Speaker, for those of us from Kentucky and, I think, throughout the country, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] sets a standard for service to this House, as was said by the Speaker.

He sets a standard for grace and charm for all of us who might be in public life, and I think he sets a standard, for those of us who care about those we serve, our constituents, and all we can do is strive toward that standard, but we can never equal it. Mr. Speaker, it will always be a goal we will try to strive for.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAZZOLI. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I, like many in this body today, feel very close to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this Member knows him well.

For the last 20 years, Mr. Speaker, when we have been in session, we have had breakfast together, and I would like to say, "God bless you, BILL NATCHER. We look forward to seeing you back at breakfast, and it's your time to buy."

TRIBUTE TO THE SERVICE OF WILLIAM H. NATCHER

(Mr. ROGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker and Members of this august body, today, of course, is a different day for everyone in this body except two because this is, of course, the first time in 40 years and 18,401 votes that the voting light beside BILL NATCHER'S name stayed dark. And this is the first day he has missed work in his 40 years of service to this body and to this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all watched that light up there knowing that it would come on before the voting time

expired because it always has. We have always known that, all but two Members of this body who came here senior to Mr. NATCHER. That unbroken voting record, of course, is unmatched, not just in this body, but in every other national legislative body in the world.

More important, Mr. Speaker, than the quantity of his votes, however, has been the quality of his service to the House and to the Nation. His devotion to duty is evidenced in these last few weeks by his painful journey to this body to cast votes, and with this incredible voting record that he has amassed, never to be superseded, there is even more proof to the body of his legislative achievement, his quietly working behind the scenes putting together those appropriations bills which made massive changes in America and its people.

None of us know, Mr. Speaker, a more courteous, or dignified, or considerate human being than the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. He is a neighbor to my district in Kentucky, and, of course, the dean of the Kentucky delegation and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations where I have the honor of serving with him. None of us is more respected. No one is more admired. No one has the rectitude of BILL NATCHER. But we also learned over these years that one could not mistake that courtliness, from another age really, with timidity or reticence. BILL NATCHER was forceful, is forceful. He is resolute. He is crisp. He is commanding in his leadership and in his beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, in an age of cynicism toward politicians the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] remains a pillar of rectitude and of admired devotion to duty, and he makes us all proud to serve in this House and be his colleague here.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] appreciates all of our prayers, and he knows of our love and devotion. We have shown that to him. He also knows of the care and concern of every Kentuckian from every county and community in our State who are praying for his quick recovery and return to his beloved House here and his beloved home in Kentucky.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pulaski for yielding to me, and I would just like to add my devotion to BILL NATCHER as a colleague in this House of Representatives, the pride that I have in serving with the gentleman having the respect of everyone in Kentucky. There is not one person in Kentucky that I know that has anything but the deepest respect for BILL NATCHER as a servant of the people.

Mr. Speaker, if we could make a prototype of a person to serve in this

House of Representatives, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] would be that prototype. As my colleagues know, 18,000-plus votes and 40 years of service uninterrupted for the people of this House of Representatives, the people of his district, the people of the Commonwealth.

However, Mr. Speaker, more than that the people of the United States of America know what a job BILL NATCHER has performed, and I am proud to have served in this House with the gentleman from Kentucky, and I am more proud to call him my friend and fellow Kentuckian.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

□ 1150

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very historic moment in this House of Representatives, and I just cannot refrain from making mention of the very telling conversation I had with BILL yesterday after BILL had cast his next-to-last vote. We were in our old Appropriations Committee room, and I was making my point with BILL about how he had already made his mark in history through this tremendous unblemished record, and that I would hope he would give serious thought to the tremendous opportunities we have here through advances in medical science to make him whole again, and that, from my point of view and, I am sure, from the point of view of his constituents in the country, much more important than extending a voting record, I feel it would be so much better for him to give those people the opportunity to make him whole, and that that would mean so much to his grandchildren to whom he has written regularly about the history of this body and his experience in it, and how much more memorable it would be if he could live a sufficient number of years in the future, regardless of the voting record, to be able to tell those grandchildren about it personally and to amplify on what he had written.

I hope that maybe it might have had a little impact on BILL, as he then went back to the hospital last night and thought it all over again. So for me, I have to be happy that BILL has made that agonizing decision when I thought maybe he just would not come to grips with it in that way.

I certainly want to endorse and subscribe to everything that has been said about him here today. You folks from Kentucky know him so well. I spent so many of my years, 20 years in this House on the Appropriations Committee with him. I became the ranking member of our subcommittee, and he eventually became our chairman. We

were so close in our deliberations with one another, and I have to say there was no finer subcommittee chairman or full committee chairman from the standpoint of fairness and, yes, working industriously as he was tending to his duties every day.

So rather than detain the House any longer from this Member of Congress, may I simply say that I embrace all those wonderful things that have been said. And, BILL, if by chance you are listening on the monitor, I want to just say again that we, I am sure, speaking for all the Members of this House, will keep praying for you, and we are happy about your decision, because it suggests to me that you can again be made whole and live to tell those grandchildren any number of stories for a number of years to come, and we will be happy to welcome you back to the House when that time comes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, may I say this: Mr. Leader, I think I can safely say for BILL NATCHER that you are going to come out OK in his journal. Of course, BILL NATCHER is going to come out OK in all our journals as well.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I will be succinct.

I think even more important than the votes is that we should know the character of BILL NATCHER. I have three Members from the other side of the aisle who really touched me and helped me, especially when I was a freshman. One was JOHN LEWIS, and another was CRAIG WASHINGTON. And I say, yes, CRAIG, I will support you.

The other one was BILL NATCHER. But I was madder than a hornet at BILL NATCHER one day when he was on the other side of the aisle and we were arguing and debating an issue. Being a hot-headed freshman, I was steaming. BILL NATCHER walked over to this inexperienced freshman and put his arm around me, and he said, "DUKE, you know, in Kentucky, we have these young horses that run and they get so much adrenaline that they break their legs and we have to shoot them."

I thought, man, he is threatening me. Then he looked at me and put his arm around me and he said, "DUKE, if you will just slow down a bit, I'll show you how to win the race."

And more than just win the race, he did help me. It is that kind of leadership that I think all of us enjoyed.

Mr. ROGERS. BILL NATCHER, our hearts and our prayers are with you for a quick and speedy return to your place.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was commu-

nicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DARDEN). At this point the Chair will proceed in the following manner:

The Chair will receive up to 15 1-minute speeches from Members on both sides of the aisle.

A FURTHER TRIBUTE TO BILL NATCHER

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, when I was elected to the 100th Congress and came to Washington to go through the orientation process, I immediately realized what a giant of a man Mr. NATCHER is. We had a routine that we went through, because we would always talk about Kentucky, which is my native States, and whenever I would speak to him or ask him about anything, he would always say to me, "Aren't you from Pulaski County?" And after I said, "Yes, sir, I am," then we could get on with the business of the day.

I want to comment, not only on his voting record, which will never be equaled in the universe, but on the fact that he loved his grandchildren so much and every day he sat down and wrote an individual letter to each one of them. Last year he lost one of his beloved grandsons in an automobile accident, and his grief was painful to watch.

What I would like to say to Mr. NATCHER, if I could, is, "Mr. NATCHER, lay down that burden of never missing a vote. The people in the Second District certainly understand your faithful service."

Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody else in the country could ever follow or match his reelection record. I am told that the most Mr. NATCHER ever spent on a campaign was \$50, and that that money was only for gasoline. He had no pamphlets, no bumper stickers, no media. He simply drove around his district every 2 years, and without any question, unfailingly, they sent him back.

It has been a wonderful record, Mr. NATCHER, and when you come back, you can complete it. But nobody has voted more than you, and your record will stand. We hope that you really will not worry about it. Just get well.

A PLEDGE TO FIGHT CRIME BY RENDERING JUSTICE AND GUARANTEEING LIBERTY

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have just rendered a pledge to our flag and the Republic for which it stands.

Mr. Speaker, a republic is people. People working equally as one nation. Under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Yes, under God we have united and have been granted a government, to protect the liberty and render justice for all.

We protect our liberty through faith, patriotism, and a strong defense. Would be aggressors fear our strength and respect our values.

However, the aggressor we fear most walks among us, dividing us from within—the criminal.

We must make the criminal as fearful of violating our liberty as any aggressor we have faced.

Mr. Speaker, only justice will render such fear.

We as dutiful officers of the Republic must harness the criminal element through justice.

Justice will only prevail when we as a Congress swallow our thirst for power and assist our local and State governments in stopping the criminal threat to our liberty.

THE HEALTH CARE CRISIS

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, there are those in this body who would have America believe there is no health care crisis.

I stand before you today to say, shame on them. Shame on them for trying to deny over 37 million of their fellow citizens who stand to lose everything they have, if they are faced with a serious illness or injury.

Those who live in rural areas like my own district have an even greater problem—that of access. They often put off going to the doctor until they are faced with a medical emergency. Then, they have to drive many miles to the nearest hospital.

Mr. Speaker, this is expensive, inhumane, and unacceptable. It is a crisis of the worst sort. We must have health care reform now, with coverage that is universal, affordable, and portable. And for the people who live in rural areas and urban centers where access is a tremendous problem, we must empower community health centers to do what they do best.

We must protect this grassroots health care delivery system if we are ever to fully address the problem of access. I ask you to join me in support of the Access to Community Health Care Act, and the Community Health Improvement Act. They will ensure that this main artery to preventive health care will not be shut off from those who so desperately need it.

□ 1200

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the White House yesterday denied that there was a conflict of interest when Hillary Clinton sued a political supporter for the Government, and settled for less than she should have.

The White House also doesn't think it is unusual that Mrs. Clinton's associates sold short pharmaceutical company stocks right before she publicly attacked those companies in the media.

Clearly, the White House doesn't know the definition of conflict of interest.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are serious questions raised by the ethical lapses of the Clinton administration. The President's credibility on health care and crime must be reexamined in light of these ethics questions.

How can we trust a Government to run our health care when it cannot take care of its own business without waste, fraud, and abuse of the people's trust?

How can we trust a President to fight crime when his own administration has ethical problems? The American people need to know the answers to these questions.

CONSTITUTION COVERS AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, for more than 4 years, Alex and Kay Council fought the IRS, trying desperately to provide that they did not owe \$70,000, that grew to \$300,000. They said the IRS was ruthless—so ruthless, that Alex Council believed he had no other choice to provide money for his family, so he took his own life. He left a note, and he said, "Use the insurance money to stop this illegal agency that is out of control and fight, by God, for our family."

Mr. Speaker, a court in North Carolina ruled the following: No. 1, his deduction was completely legal; and No. 2, the IRS never made notice.

The IRS said they sent a letter, and it did not need to be certified. It was an oversight.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress ought to be ashamed of ourselves. If Charles Manson is innocent until proven guilty, an American taxpayer should be treated the same way. Discharge Petition No. 12 says a taxpayer is innocent until proven guilty and the Constitution still means something in our country.

TRY IT, YOU'LL LIKE IT?

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to their health care reform plan, the Clinton White House is saying to the American people, "Try it. You'll like it."

But after looking at the particulars of this proposal, the people are gagging on the Clinton plan. Eight out of ten fear, rightfully, that the quality of their health care will go down with the Clinton bill.

Most business groups oppose the President's employer mandate, which will drive thousands of small businesses out of business and millions of Americans out of their jobs.

And the public has rebelled against getting its health care spoon-fed by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the American people don't have to try the Clinton plan to know they won't like it. They just have to look at the specifics. And as they do, their prognosis is: The Clinton bill is dead.

DEMOCRATIC ACTION SPEAKS LOUDER THAN REPUBLICAN WORDS

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress passed the largest deficit reduction package in history. During the debate on that economic plan, Republican rhetoric did not reflect reality.

For example, on February 18 of last year, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] said, "I will tell you this: This program will not give you deficit reduction. It will be a disaster for the performance of the economy."

Mr. Speaker, the reality is that President Clinton's economic plan has reduced the deficit to its lowest level since 1979 relative to the gross economy. The reality is that the actual deficit for the last year was \$73 billion lower than that projected in President Bush's budget.

Mr. Speaker, the deficit is projected to fall to \$226 billion this year, and decline again to \$178 billion in 1995, putting our Nation on track for 3 years of reduced deficit. This is the first time this has happened since a Democrat, Harry Truman, was in the White House.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to deficit reduction, it is clear that Democratic actions speak louder than Republican words.

GLOBAL WARMING—LET US PUT IT IN PERSPECTIVE

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today concerning an issue that I am sure is on everybody's mind, global warming. I say this with tongue in cheek as an admonition.

It is obvious to all of us as we are dealing with this latest snowstorm here that the blistering apocalypse of global warming is putting everything in perspective.

After all, during the big January snowstorm, temperatures dipped below zero. In the February snow and ice storm, the thermometer dropped into the single digits. And here in March, the coldest it will get during this snowstorm is only the twenties.

Judging by this winter, you'd think that a new ice age is upon us. Of course, it would be ridiculous to judge long-term climatic changes on one winter in one part of the country. Unfortunately, equally ridiculous claims of global warming have been made based on short-term weather trends, and have helped shape policy in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, let us keep this long, cold winter in mind the next time Congress is asked to push good science aside and make policy based on hyperbole and hysteria.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET POINTS WAY TO STRONGER ECONOMY

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, we all know that there is a right way and a wrong way to do everything, and the effort to deal with the budget deficit is no exception. Today in the Budget Committee we begin marking up the fiscal year 1995 budget, and continue what we began last year—dealing with the budget deficit the right way.

We will continue to set priorities, make tough choices, and focus resources where they are needed most. We will stay within the very tight discretionary caps adopted last year. And we will keep that deficit on a downward path.

That is the right way. The wrong way is to offer phony panaceas and miracle cures—rhetorical flourishes instead of real fixes. That's the approach taken by those who oppose the President's budget.

Last year, Republicans predicted the President's budget would be a disaster for the economy. They said it would do nothing to reduce the deficit. They said it would slow economic growth. And they were wrong, wrong, wrong.

There is a right way and a wrong way to do everything. Mr. Speaker, we have

now started to do things the right way. Let us continue what we have begun by passing the President's budget, and keeping America on the path to a stronger economy.

ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, in his State of the Union Address, Clinton told us that as long as he is President, the military will be the best equipped, best trained, and best prepared fighting force on the face of the Earth. No more cuts, he stood right there and said.

But actions speak louder than words. Just a few short weeks have passed, and yesterday the Secretary of the Army said what Clinton really meant to say was no more cuts beyond what he had already planned to cut.

So much for the Clinton credibility. Defense is back on the chopping block, this time to cut personnel by 181,000. The Army, of course, takes the biggest hit.

For a decade now the Defense Department has been the only Federal agency to see its budget cut. But look around you. We have got problems in Somalia, Communists with nuclear capability in Korea, and bloody violence in Bosnia. The cold war may be over, but we do not have the capability, given the numbers we are looking at now, to respond adequately to many of these challenges.

Ronald Reagan believed in peace through strength. According to Solzhenitsyn, who is going back to Russia, he said that Ronald Reagan, with that belief, brought about the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Berlin Wall.

Mr. Clinton, do not tell us. Show us that you are committed to a military that will ensure the security of all Americans and our interests around the world.

CHICKEN LITTLE AWARDS

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, during the last couple weeks we have seen all sorts of medals and awards being handed out in the Olympics and the Grammys, but the awards being handed out in Congress today are the most important ones, for looking to the future.

What are they? They are chickens running through the halls giving Chicken Little awards to many of the Republicans, because they are the ones last year who not one of them voted for the budget and made all sorts of wrong predictions. There were more dead wrong predictions than we can even talk about.

□ 1210

Let me just point out one. One Member came out and said this is really the Dr. Kevorkian plan for our economy. Oh, really? The economy seems to be booming more than we ever anticipated. Look at the Greenspan report. Look at everything else.

I hope as we enter this year's budget it will not be partisan and we will deal with real facts and not Republican rhetoric.

FRIENDS IN NAME ONLY

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, Canada may be our good northern neighbor, but it is not friendly in trade matters. The Journal of Commerce reports that last year, under the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement [CFTA], a five member dispute resolution panel overturned a 6.5 percent duty placed by the United States on imports of Canadian softwood lumber.

The tariff was to offset Canadian subsidies which had pushed down lumber prices in the United States. American lumber officials charged that two Canadian panel members had ties to both the Canadian lumber industry and Canadian Government. This is not the first time the United States has charged a conflict of interest on the dispute panels.

Trade negotiators are concerned that the CFTA panel reveals a critical flaw in the dispute panel system. This decision exposes the fact that special interests can influence the panels and harm U.S. interests. Remember CFTA panels, NAFTA panels and GATT panels all operate the same. We should say no to this system when we debate GATT, the granddaddy of the agreements.

MISLEADING POLITICAL RHETORIC

(Mrs. UNSOELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, rhetoric flows freely in this well and throughout this House, particularly political rhetoric. Last year it foamed and flowed over the Clinton economic package. In August, Mr. KASICH said, "We will come back here next year and try to help you when this puts the economy in the gutter." The minority whip said, "I believe this will lead to a recession next year. This is the Democrat machine's recession, and each one of them will be held personally accountable."

Mr. Alan Greenspan is hardly a flaming radical, but at the end of January of this year he said, "I do not recall as good an underlying base for the long-

term outlook as we have today in the last two or three decades."

Mr. Speaker, I will gladly be accountable for what has taken place, but for what will we make the minority whip accountable?

ANOTHER MONSTER LOOSE IN THE LAND

(Mr. HORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, when we think about walking through the Jurassic Park as portrayed in the book and the movie, we know we need a catastrophic health care plan. Indeed, there is a catastrophic health care plan. If there were a legislative sequel to it, it would be the President's plan that promises to be just like Jurassic Park in terms of viciousness and scariness. It creates 105 new bureaucracies and expands 40 more. According to the Congressional Budget Office, it adds \$70 billion more to the deficit. Another trillion dollars will be expended by the year 2000.

There are those that paid the admission fee for the movie Jurassic Park and found it worth the money, at least in technique, but many Americans will find that the legislative sequel will be a high budget, low quality production. When the dinosaur ideas of the Clinton monster plan cut into the hard-earned savings of the American family, the American people will wish that they had never entered that theater.

A SUCCESSFUL BUDGET AND A HEALTH CARE REFORM PLAN THAT WILL WORK

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago the opponents of health care reform announced no crisis in health care. Now we hear them declaring the health care security plan dead. These prognostications remind me more than a little bit of things we were hearing last year about the President's budget. Last year one of our opponents said that the President's budget will stifle economic growth, destroy jobs, reduce revenues, and increase the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at what has happened. Today the deficit is projected to be 40-percent lower than it was projected to be 1 year ago. Today housing starts are up over 25 percent, and single-family starts are their highest level in 15 years.

Under the President's budget, nearly 2 million jobs were created last year, including 1.7 million in the private sector, 70 percent more than was created in the whole 4 years previously.

Mr. Speaker, the President's budget is working, and now we need to get on with reforming our health care delivery system.

URGING FULL DISCLOSURE OF THE WHITEWATER TRANSACTION

(Mr. LEACH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, there are many elements of the so-called Whitewater affair that are a bit esoteric. But the revelations of the past few days that officials of the Department of the Treasury and Resolution Trust Corporation briefed key White House aides on potential legal action which independent regulatory agencies might be obligated to take against the President and First Lady subvert one of the fundamental premises of American democracy—that this is a country of laws and not men.

In America, process is our most important product. No individual, whatever his or her rank, is privileged in the eyes of the law. No public official has the right to influence possible legal actions against him or herself. For this reason agencies of the Government as well as the White House have precise rules that govern their employees.

Let me cite, in particular, the following Department of Treasury standard which appears patently to be violated. Under "Rules of Conduct," 31 CFR, section 0.735-30 states:

An employee should avoid any action * * * which might result in, or create the appearance of * * * (2) Giving preferential treatment to any person; * * * (4) Losing complete independence or impartiality; (5) Making a Government decision outside official channels; or (6) Affecting adversely the confidence of the public in the integrity of the Government.

Similarly, the following standards contained in 12 CFR section 1605.7 apply to RTC employees:

No employees shall engage in any action, which might result in, or create the appearance of * * * (b) giving preferential treatment to any person; * * * (d) losing complete independence or impartiality; (e) making an RTC decision outside official channels; or, (f) adversely affecting the public's confidence in the integrity of the RTC.

Likewise, the following standards apply to the White House—3 CFR, section 100.735-4:

In all circumstances employees shall conduct themselves so as to exemplify the highest standards of integrity. An employee shall avoid any action, whether or not specifically prohibited by this subpart, which might result in, or create the appearance of: (1) Using public office for private gain; (2) Giving preferential treatment to any person; * * * (4) Losing complete independence or impartiality; (5) Making a Government decision outside official channels; or (6) Affecting adversely the confidence of the public in the integrity of the Government.

Seldom have the public and private ethics of lawyers in the White House

and executive branch departments and agencies been so thoroughly devalued.

All participants in these meetings should be brought before Congress to provide full public disclosure of their actions and discussions.

VIOLENCE—A THREAT TO SOCIETY

(Mr. TOWNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, once again the city of New York and its citizens have been victimized and assaulted.

Unfortunately, violence has become pandemic in our society. However, I applaud the efforts of the New York City Police Department, and those concerned citizens, that assisted cutting across ethnic and religious lines, that have resulted in the speedy apprehension of the alleged gunman who perpetrated the heinous and barbaric act against innocent individuals. The victims were concerned solely with their religious faith and devotion.

I offer my condolences to members of the Lubavitcher community who have suffered terribly as a result of this crime. And I also offer my gratitude to them for their restraint. I also commend the Arab community for assisting in the apprehension of the alleged gunman. It is gratifying that despite the prevailing pain, anguish, and anger, emotions have been tempered and calm actions have been maintained.

I encourage all New Yorkers to seek common bonds of understanding so that we can eradicate the bigotry and prejudice that is the root cause of many of these violent acts.

□ 1220

TRIBUTE TO WTOP NEWS RADIO 1500

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate station WTOP-AM, Washington, DC's only all-news radio, on its 25th anniversary, and to extend my very best wishes to its 23 anchors, 11 reporters, 12 editors, and 2 writers.

I would like to especially commend the station's Capitol Hill reporter, Dave McConnell, who day after day, vote after vote, with style and grace, informs his listeners about the legislation, the personalities, and the drama of the U.S. Congress.

I would also like to salute WTOP's energetic Montgomery County reporter, Janice Sosebee, a former student of mine at Montgomery College, who covers the people and news of my home county and my congressional district.

Twenty-four hours a day, in good times and bad, those of us who live in the Washington metro area know we can rely on WTOP for the latest in news, weather, and sports. It has never let us down since its debut as an all-news outlet in 1969.

EARLY RESULTS SHOW BRADY LAW WORKS

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, today is day 3 of the Brady law and the early evidence is already in: careful gun control works, and works well.

During the first 48 hours of the new law, convicted criminals and mentally unstable people all across the Nation have been denied guns.

In Utah, 4 felons were refused guns; in Kentucky, 8; in Colorado, 17; in Nevada, 6; in Louisiana, 10; in just one city in Texas, 13 were turned away; and in Kansas, 5.

And the list goes on and on across the Nation. Criminals are denied access to guns without doing any harm to the law-abiding gun owners.

In fact the attorney general of Kansas estimated that as many as 10 percent of those trying to buy guns in Kansas will be caught by the Brady law and they won't get a handgun.

Law enforcement, parents, concerned citizens, and community leaders are delighted. We don't know exactly how many lives may be saved, how many stores won't be held up, how many kids won't be shot on the way to school, how many domestic disputes won't end in blazing gunfire.

But we do know this: lives will be saved. We know that over 60 people who shouldn't have a handgun in just the 7 States I have cited won't walk away with a handgun, thanks to the Brady law.

Mr. Speaker, the irony is that only the NRA thinks this is a bad thing.

Only the NRA will keep pretending that a disastrous assault on the constitution is going on here.

Only the NRA will keep falsely claiming the Brady law won't help in the battle against handgun violence.

Only the NRA will keep denying what everyone else can see.

The good news, my colleagues, is that the American people will see that the NRA has not been telling the truth. Americans will see every day in every State that rational gun control works, protects lives, and does no harm to the law abiding, whether they own guns or not.

ACCESS TO CHILDREN'S HEALTH CARE ACT OF 1994

(Ms. LAMBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Access to Children's Health Care Act of 1994. This bill will allow children's hospitals to qualify as federally qualified health centers [FQHC] by giving children's hospitals outpatient services exemptions to certain FQHC provisions. These provisions will strengthen the vital safety net of services for low income and underserved children with special health care needs.

Children's hospitals provide almost half of all their care to poor children. As the number of children in poverty have grown and private coverage of dependents has declined, children's hospitals have increasingly become the primary care pediatrician and pediatric specialist for children. In addition, children's hospitals accept all children regardless of their ability to pay and substantially underwrite outpatient care.

By allowing children's hospitals to qualify as FQHC's, the hospitals will receive reimbursement based on reasonable costs as defined by Medicaid.

This bill has the support of the National Association of Community Health Centers, which recognizes the need to maintain and strengthen community resources. In addition, this legislation is a top priority for the National Association of Children's Hospitals and related institutions.

Access to care is a vital part of health reform. This legislation is not only important within the context of the current Medicaid program, it also will assure that children's hospitals will be recognized as essential providers under reform proposals.

I urge my colleagues to take a serious look at this proposal to guarantee appropriate health care access for the children in their districts with special health needs.

CLINTON CARE-LOWER QUALITY

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Washington Post reported that 80 percent of Americans fear that the Clinton health plan would reduce the quality of health care in this country. The same poll showed more Americans disapprove of the President's plan than support it. That is certainly consistent with the message I am receiving from constituents in my district.

Most telling however, is the fact that now more than 60 percent of Americans feel like they actually know something about the proposal and the bottom line: The more people learn about the President's 1,300-page bill—and its arbitrary price controls, big government alliances, and new bureaucracies—the more skeptical they become.

In other words, the more they know, the more they dislike, notwithstanding rhetoric cranked out at a dizzying speed by White House spin doctors. It is time to move on to other choices—and there are other choices, better choices like the Rowland-Bilirakis bill—that deserve attention and action.

STOP FEEDING ADDICTS HABITS

(Mr. HERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, most Americans were outraged that a Federal court recently ruled that the SSI Disability Program must pay nearly \$20,000-plus monthly to a convicted heroin drug dealer who said he needed the money to support his habit.

Drug addicts and alcoholics who receive disability benefits should be required to receive treatment as a condition of eligibility. Right now, that is not the case.

I have introduced a companion bill to legislation which was adopted unanimously in the other body yesterday to streamline the disability program so that the Federal Government doesn't continue to feed life destroying addictions. It also requires a responsible party to be named to oversee benefits paid to addicts and alcoholics. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support this much needed reform of our disability system.

UPTURN IN THE ECONOMY

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I do not usually take 1 minutes, but sitting here listening to the 1 minutes I became very, very amused because some very intelligent people would have us believe that somehow or other last year's budget process had something to do with the upturn of the economy. Now, those very intelligent people certainly remember that the upturn of the economy began in the third quarter of 1992, I repeat, the third quarter of 1992. That is before we got to the budget process.

I would also remind them that we will not know what effect April 15 will have on the economy until about December of this year. I hope that it will not have an ill-effect, but we will not know that for another several months.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF WTOP RADIO NEWS

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today as we drive home from work many of us will turn on WTOP 1500 on our radio dial and we will hear Dave McConnell report on the very sad and historic occasion that occurred today. One of the finest gentlemen to ever serve in the U.S. House of Representatives missed his first vote after never having missed a vote in 42 years. After over 18,000 consecutive votes he had to miss today's vote.

I did not plan to mention that, but rather to focus on the fact that today is the 25th anniversary of WTOP, a station that has defined itself by its professional and objective reporting. It was Walter Cronkite, Connie Chung, Sam Donaldson, and a host of other familiar names who got their start with WTOP. It brings a lot to the Washington area.

I wish today that the news that it were reporting was not so sad. All of us grieve over the fact that such a respected, esteemed colleague has missed his first vote, and we wish him all the best. He certainly is in our thoughts and has our prayers at Bethesda Naval Hospital.

HEALTH CARE: DO NOT CREATE NEW GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACIES

(Mr. DOOLITTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, achieving Government mandated health coverage such as advocated by President Clinton and others will require a Government intrusion into the lives of both employers and individuals. Implementing such a mandate will require the Government to make insurance affordable by rationing health care and imposing price controls. Price controls will lead to higher taxes, bigger deficits, and health care rationing.

Employer mandates and mandatory health alliances will have a significantly negative impact on jobs and on the character and quality of our health care.

We should focus our effort instead on reforming the current system rather than creating a new Government bureaucracy. Our goal, as policymakers, ought not to be to mandate insurance coverage for everyone, rather it ought to be to make sure that all Americans are guaranteed access to health insurance, making that access as easy and consumer friendly as possible within our means.

ADVICE FOR THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to recommend to the President and his senior staff that they read today's column by Al Hunt in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Whitewater: It's the Coverup More Than the Deal."

There was a point where President Nixon could have, I think, saved his Presidency by decisively bringing in outside counsel, listening to them, and doing whatever it took to obey the law and to enforce public trust even at the expense of personal friendship. There was a point where President Reagan felt compelled to create the Tower Commission to look into a series of allegations and to try to find out what had happened in the White House.

I am afraid, with yesterday's revelations and today's revelations involving the Justice Department, the RTC, and a whole range of clearly unethical and inappropriate behaviors by senior appointees, that the Clinton Presidency is very close to a problem that, in fact, could ultimately unravel its entire ability to function.

I would hope the President would take seriously the recommendation to relieve the current counsel, Mr. Nussbaum, to bring in a total outsider of impeccable credentials, respected by everyone, to insist that that person go through the entire administration, insisting on ethical, accountable behavior, and establishing firm principles that fit the law and that fit the procedures the country should expect of the executive branch.

I simply would suggest to the President and his senior staff that this is potentially a very critical turning point for the administration, and it should not go into a defensive bunker mentality, and it should not wait for an independent counsel like Mr. Fisk to give it the bad news after the fact, and it should not tolerate its aides engaging in coverup.

REPORT CONCERNING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VIS-CLOSKEY) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of August 2, 1993, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order No. 12722 of August 2, 1990. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the

International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

Executive Order No. 12722 ordered the immediate blocking of all property and interests in property of the Government of Iraq (including the Central Bank of Iraq), then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of a U.S. person. That order also prohibited the importation into the United States of goods and services of Iraqi origin, as well as the exportation of goods, services, and technology from the United States to Iraq. The order prohibited travel-related transactions to or from Iraq and the performance of any contract in support of any industrial, commercial, or governmental project in Iraq. U.S. persons were also prohibited from granting or extending credit or loans to the Government of Iraq.

The foregoing prohibitions (as well as the blocking of Government of Iraq property) were continued and augmented on August 9, 1990, by Executive Order No. 12724, which was issued in order to align the sanctions imposed by the United States with United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 661 of August 6, 1990.

Executive Order No. 12817 was issued on October 21, 1992, to implement in the United States measures adopted in United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 778 of October 2, 1992. Resolution 778 requires U.N. member states temporarily to transfer to a U.N. escrow account up to \$200 million apiece in Iraqi oil sale proceeds paid by purchasers after the imposition of U.N. sanctions on Iraq. These funds finance Iraq's obligations for U.N. activities with respect to Iraq, such as expenses to verify Iraqi weapons destruction and to provide humanitarian assistance in Iraq on a nonpartisan basis. A portion of the escrowed funds will also fund the activities of the U.N. Compensation Commission in Geneva, which will handle claims from victims of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. The funds placed in the escrow account are to be returned, with interest, to the member states that transferred them to the United Nations, as funds are received from future sales of Iraqi oil authorized by the U.N. Security Council. No member state is required to fund more than half of the total contributions to the escrow account.

This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order No. 12722 and matters relating to Executive Orders Nos. 12724 and 12817. The report covers events from August 2, 1993, through February 1, 1994.

1. During the reporting period, there were technical amendments to the Iraqi Sanctions Regulations relating to notification of transfers into blocked accounts and registration of persons holding blocked property, 58 Fed. Reg.

47643 (September 10, 1993). A copy of the amendments is attached for reference.

2. Investigations of possible violations of the Iraqi sanctions continue to be pursued and appropriate enforcement actions taken. These are intended to deter future activities in violation of the sanctions. Additional civil penalty notices were prepared during the reporting period for violations of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and Iraqi Sanctions Regulations with respect to transactions involving Iraq. Three penalties totaling nearly \$54,000 were collected from three banks for violation of the prohibitions against funds transfers to Iraq, and noncompliance with reporting requirements and an Office of Foreign Assets Control directive license.

3. Investigation also continues into the roles played by various individuals and firms outside Iraq in the Iraqi government procurement network. These investigations may lead to additions to the Office of Foreign Assets Control's listing of individuals and organizations determined to be Specially Designated Nationals of the Government of Iraq.

4. Pursuant to Executive Order No. 12817 implementing United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 778, on October 26, 1992, the Office of Foreign Assets Control directed the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to establish a blocked account for receipt of certain post-August 6, 1990, Iraqi oil sales proceeds, and to hold, invest, and transfer these funds as required by the order. On July 20, 1993, following payments by the Governments of Saudi Arabia and Denmark of, respectively \$40,589,419.00 and \$674,360.00, to the special United Nations-controlled account, entitled United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 778 Escrow Account, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$41,263,779.00 from the blocked account it holds to the United Nations-controlled account. Similarly, on August 2, 1993, following the payment of \$1,765,138.33 by the Government of the United Kingdom, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$1,765,138.33 to the United Nations-controlled account; on September 11, 1993, following payments of \$1,547,054.35 by the Government of Canada, \$276,000.00 by the Government of Greece, \$3,196,897.72 from the Commission of the European Community, and \$1,006,614.89 from the Government of Denmark, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$6,026,566.96 to the United Nations-controlled account; and on December 15, 1993, following payments of \$5,223,880.60 by the Government of the United Kingdom, \$621,426.80 by the Government of Germany, and \$1,219,941.98 from the Government of the Netherlands, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to

transfer a corresponding amount of \$7,065,249.38 to the United Nations-controlled account. Total transfers from the blocked Federal Reserve Bank of New York account since issuance of Executive Order No. 12817 have amounted to \$107,613,270.99 of the \$200 million for which the United States is potentially obligated, on a matching basis, pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 778.

5. Since the last report, there have been developments in one case. In *Campia et al. v. Newcomb et al.*, a settlement was entered into by the parties addressing payment of back rent to the landlord and return to the landlord of premises leased by the Matrix Churchill Corporation. To implement the settlement, certain blocked property owned by Matrix Churchill was sold, with the proceeds placed in a blocked account. Matrix Churchill's remaining property and records were placed in secure storage.

6. The Office of Foreign Assets Control has issued a total of 444 specific licenses regarding transactions pertaining to Iraq or Iraqi assets since August 1990. Since my last report, 53 specific licenses have been issued. Licenses were issued for transactions such as the filing of legal actions against Iraqi governmental entities, for legal representation of Iraq, and the exportation to Iraq of donated medicine, medical supplies, and food intended for humanitarian relief purposes, the execution of powers of attorney relating to the administration of personal assets and decedents' estates in Iraq, and the protection of pre-existent intellectual property rights in Iraq.

7. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6 month period from August 2, 1993, through February 1, 1994, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Iraq are reported at about \$3.1 million, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, the Bureau of Near East and South Asian Affairs, the Bureau of International Organizations, and the Office of the Legal Adviser), and the Department of Transportation (particularly the U.S. Coast Guard).

8. The United States imposed economic sanctions on Iraq in response to Iraq's invasion and illegal occupation of Kuwait, a clear act of brutal aggression. The United States, together with the international community, is maintaining economic sanctions against Iraq because the Iraqi regime, despite

international will, has failed to comply fully with United Nations Security Council resolutions. Security Council resolutions on Iraq call for the elimination of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, the inviolability of the Iraq-Kuwait boundary, the release of Kuwaiti and other third-country nationals, compensation for victims of Iraqi aggression, long-term monitoring of weapons of mass destruction capabilities, the return of Kuwaiti assets stolen during Iraq's illegal occupation of Kuwait, renunciation of terrorism, an end to internal Iraqi repression of its own civilian population, and the facilitation of access of international relief organizations to all those in need in all parts of Iraq. Nonetheless, we see a pattern of defiance: repeated public claims to Kuwait, sponsorship of terrorism, incomplete declarations to weapons inspectors, and ongoing widespread human rights violations, among other things. The U.N. sanctions remain in place; the United States will continue to enforce those sanctions under domestic authority.

The Baghdad government continued to violate basic human rights by repressing the Iraqi civilian population and depriving it of humanitarian assistance. For more than 2 years, Baghdad has maintained a complete blockade of food, fuel, and medicine on northern Iraq. The Iraqi military routinely harasses residents of the north, and has attempted to "Arabize" Kurdish, Turcoman, and Assyrian areas in the north. Iraq continues to launch artillery attacks against civilian population centers in the south, and its efforts to drain the southern marshes have forced thousands to flee to neighboring States.

In 1991, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolutions 706 and 712 that permit Iraq to sell up to \$1.6 billion of oil under U.N. auspices to fund the provision of food, medicine, and other humanitarian supplies to the people of Iraq. Under the U.N. resolutions, the equitable distribution within Iraq of this assistance would be supervised and monitored by the United Nations. The Iraqi regime so far has refused to accept these resolutions and has thereby chosen to perpetuate the suffering of its civilian population. In October 1993, the Iraqi government informed the United Nations that it would not implement Resolutions 706 and 712.

The policies and actions of the Saddam Hussein regime continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, as well as to regional peace and security. Because of Iraq's failure to comply fully with United Nations Security Council resolutions, the United States will continue to apply economic sanctions to deter Iraq from threatening peace and stability in the region, and I will con-

tinue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 1994.

IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 366 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6.

□ 1234

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to extend for 6 years the authorizations of appropriations for the programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for certain other purposes, with Mr. HUGHES, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, March 2, 1994, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ] had been disposed of.

Are there further amendments to title I of the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education Act?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHNER

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOEHNER:

Page 66, after line 18, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

"SEC. 1116. SCHOOL CHOICE.

"(a) CHOICE PROGRAMS.—A local education agency may use funds under this part, in combination with other Federal, State, local, and private funds to develop and implement choice programs, for children eligible for assistance under this title, which permit parents to select the public school that their children will attend.

"(b) CHOICE PLAN.—A local educational agency that chooses to implement a school choice plan shall first develop a comprehensive plan that includes assurances that—

"(1) all eligible students across grade levels will have equal access to the program;

"(2) the program does not include schools which follow a racially discriminatory policy;

"(3) describe how the school will use resources under this part and from other sources to implement such components;

"(4) describe how the school will provide individual student assessment results, including an interpretation of such results, to the parents of a child who participates in the assessment required by section 1111(b)(3);

"(5) the plan will be developed with the involvement of the community to be served and individuals who will carry it out, including teachers, principals, and other staff, parents, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from the school;

"(6) the plan will be made available to parents and the public; and

"(7) the program shall not include schools that do not receive funds under this title".

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which would allow school districts to use their title I funds for public school choice programs. To begin, I would like to emphasize three points.

First, this amendment is strictly optional. There is no mandate. It is up to school districts to decide whether or not they want a public school choice program.

Second, this amendment only allows for public school choice.

Third, only children eligible for assistance for title I funds can participate. These children are the poor and educationally disadvantaged. In other words, the ones most in need of a choice.

I hear a great deal on this floor about how we must help the poor, especially the children. Our goal with title I is to help these poor. What better way to help them than to allow them to get out of bad schools? What better way to help them than to allow school districts to set up programs that would allow the poor to attend a school that better suits their needs?

As a reasonably well-off parent, I and my wife have the financial ability to send our two daughters to private schools or to move into a jurisdiction with better public schools. Luckily, the public school district in which I live is one of the best in the State, so my wife and I have made the choice to send our daughters to the schools in that district. But what about the poor children just miles away? Their parents are so poor that they cannot move into another district. They cannot afford a private school. And if their district does not allow movement among schools, they may be forced to keep their children in failing schools. This amendment would allow and encourage school districts to change this and grant parents the power to get their children into better schools.

Bill and Hillary Clinton and Al and Tipper Gore should not be the only two couples in America who live in public housing that have school choice. The President in the State of the Union Address made it clear that he supports public school choice.

I also hear a great deal about how we must get parents more involved in their child's education. What better way to get this involvement, than to empower parents to make the most fundamental of decisions, where to send their child to school? Experiences with choice programs in East Harlem, Cambridge, MA and elsewhere have shown that parental involvement with a school and with their child's education is increased when they get to choose the school.

The States seem to agree with me. As a former member of the Ohio General

Assembly, I am reminded that States often are the laboratories of invention. This is why I look to such varying States as California and Minnesota, Virginia and Hawaii, Arkansas and Massachusetts, and my home State of Ohio, which all have some form of public school choice programs. We can help school districts in these States and others with this amendment.

In conclusion, I cannot emphasize enough that this amendment will help poor children, will empower poor parents, and will improve public schools. I encourage its adoption.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, many Members of this body support the concept of public school choice. Others do not. The President himself has expressed interest in this approach.

But using title I funds to develop and implement such a program I do not believe is really an appropriate use of these funds. Title I funds are a central source for our poorest schools, and the purpose of title I is to provide educational services to low-achieving students.

This amendment would change the purpose of title I from that of providing educational services to disadvantaged students to paying the administrative costs of developing and implementing choice programs.

□ 1240

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this is a good use of title I funds, and I do oppose the amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, because the amendment deals strictly with title I schools, title I children going from title I schools to another title I school, I rise in support of the amendment by our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER]. First of all, it is a local option to implement public school choice, it is entirely up to the local school. Second, the choices are limited to other title I schools. This would avoid the criticism that I would have that you would dilute title I funds and limit the effectiveness of the program if it were going to a non-title I school.

Making choices available to parents, particularly in title I programs, encourages them to be more involved in their child's education.

The amendment does not require the LEA to provide transportation.

So, because of all of those reasons, I rise in support of the gentleman's public school choice amendment.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Boehner school choice amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important amendment. Even President Clinton has stated his support for public school choice, an idea whose time has come.

Far too many students experience failure that is far worse than an "F" on a test. The

failure they experience is that of the entire public school system. Schools across the country seem to be plagued with second rate syndrome. They are falling behind and no longer offer a quality education to the youth of America.

To allow parents the option of choosing which public school their children will attend, is to empower them. By making a very small change to the status quo, this amendment would provide huge benefits to the parents and students ensnared in failing schools.

As studies have shown, and parents will tell you, they would like to have the option of sending their children to the good schools in their community, the ones with a magnetism that would draw students if choice were allowed. The mediocre schools, those that refuse to change in order to meet the educational needs of students, are stagnant and performing a grave disservice to the youth of America. If competition were injected into the educational system, these stagnant schools would be forced to improve, or cease to exist.

Competition in schools must take the form of school choice. We all know that wealthy privileged Americans, like President Clinton, can send their children to the best schools available. The poor do not have that option. They are locked into the worst and weakest schools, in spite of the fact that parents long for the ability to choose which school their children will attend. I believe parents should have more options for educating their children.

The implementation of school choice for public schools receiving title I funds would allow for the participation of parents and establish an important structure of accountability for those receiving Federal funds. I believe strongly that empowering parents with the ability to choose the school their children will attend, would make our public schools among the finest in the world.

Mr. Chairman, choice for everyone is an idea whose time has come. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Boehner amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROMERO-BARCELÓ

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ: Page 123, line 15, strike "1.62" and insert "2.5".

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I proposed an amendment to bring the students in Puerto Rico to the point where they receive the same share, the same amount that is granted for every child throughout the Nation. The House voted 258 to 70 against it.

I explained that it would only have cost each State, per child, the sum of 75 cents per month to allow the children of Puerto Rico, U.S. citizens, to be treated in the same way as all of the children throughout the Nation.

Today I am proposing an amendment that would not bring the children in

Puerto Rico to parity with the rest of the fellow citizens throughout the 50 States of the Nation but at least would give them a little fairer share of the funds being allocated through H.R. 6 for children throughout the Nation.

The formula which is applied for Puerto Rico is arbitrary. At the end, when they discuss the formulas to be applied for all the States throughout the Nation, discussed at pages 120 to 123 of H.R. 6, they end up with the last sentence, lines 13, 14, 15, that say, "For the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico the weighting factor shall be no greater than 1.62."

We are asking that that be amended to read 2.5. That still is not the largest weighting factor. The largest weighting factor is 3 points. Puerto Rico would be entitled to the largest weighting factor of 3 points. With 2.5 you take into consideration all of the children throughout the Nation and what each State would have to give up on an average would be a little bit over 3 cents per month per child covered by the act—38 cents per year per child covered by the act.

The funds that would be available then for the children of Puerto Rico, as I said before, would not bring them up to parity with the rest of the Nation even though they are United States citizens, but at least would give them an opportunity to have a better education at home.

I want to read once again the statement of policy of H.R. 6 in title I, section 1001. The statement of policy reads:

The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States that a high-quality education for all persons and a fair and equal opportunity to obtain such education (1) are a societal good necessary for creating a vibrant future. * * *

Mr. Chairman, I ask once again, we would like to tell the children of Puerto Rico: Are they considered to be part of other persons in the Nation, are they considered to be citizens of this Nation or not? Do they have a right to be treated equally or not?

Many of those children, their grandparents or their great-grandparents died in the Second World War, in the Korean war, in the Vietnam war, defending this Nation. Some of these children see their grandparents or great-grandparents who have been maimed or who have some kind of difficulty as a result of the wounds they suffered defending this Nation in the wars in which they participated.

Mr. Chairman, Puerto Ricans are equal in death, they are equal in time of war, there is not a halftime allotment for service in the military in the time of war. It is a full-time service.

Now, when it comes to education, they are being treated unfairly, unequally.

The Congress talks about equality, it talks about discrimination, but it is

not putting its money where its mouth is because for Puerto Rico there is a different formula. The children of Puerto Rico are being deprived of an opportunity to decrease the gap of education that exists between Puerto Rico and the Nation.

As I said yesterday, I hear from other people, "Oh, but you don't pay income taxes in Puerto Rico." That is true. But I did not vote for it. If I had a vote, I would vote for the people of Puerto Rico, the ones who can pay, would pay their income taxes so that the poor, the children, the handicapped would receive what they deserve. But I do not have a vote; you have the vote. There is no reason, no good reason why Puerto Rico cannot pay Federal income taxes.

But you have chosen to give the benefits to the large corporations, to the wealthier individuals, and deprive the children, the handicapped, the elderly, abandoned mothers with children who have no resources, of fair and equal treatment. I say the children, they do not pay taxes, but they should be allowed to at least receive a little bit more.

All I am asking each fellow Member in this House is for 3 cents per month per child who qualifies under the act in their State. I think that is very little to ask to just give the children of Puerto Rico a little better chance; not the same kind of chance, but a little better chance than they have right now under the act.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, as my chairman would say, I rise with heavy heart to oppose the amendment.

I do so because the new formula, of course, does take into consideration the fact that Puerto Rico will receive from the new formula in H.R. 6 more than 42 other States in the United States. It would put them in the top five, as a matter of fact. It will put them above Michigan and Pennsylvania in receiving new money.

So, because the fact that the formula is weighted to help areas such as Puerto Rico, I rise in opposition because it will be taking from other needy areas in the other 42 States throughout the United States.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Puerto Rico.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the reason why Puerto Rico is receiving more is because it has many more poor children than those other States. If we had the same number of poor children or a lesser number of poor children, it would be receiving less. But because it has many more poor children, then it gets penalized. They say because you have so many poor children who need an advantage, who need an opportunity to raise

the level of education so they can find a better job, so there will be less poverty in Puerto Rico, you are going to be deprived of those funds, just because we have those poor children.

□ 1250

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is why we agreed to a formula that benefits Puerto Rico and the children of Puerto Rico. Those of us in the 42 States who will lose money, because those who agreed to the formula believe that we should help the young people in Puerto Rico. So the new formula will be very helpful to Puerto Rico.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, for similar reasons enunciated by myself yesterday and by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] today I rise, again with a heavy heart, to oppose this amendment being offered by the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ].

We did in committee, of course, increase the concentration in a formula for title I, and that will help Puerto Rico, and I will continue to work with the Governor in trying to achieve statehood for the people of Puerto Rico. In that instance they will have full voting rights and will be paying Federal income tax.

But in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, to enact this amendment would mean the loss of dollars for a number of States here, many of whom are willing to give up some dollars in increasing the concentration formula. So, I do oppose the amendment, again with a heavy heart, but I feel that we must oppose it because States will lose dollars under this.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from Puerto Rico.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain once again that even though we do not pay Federal income taxes we are now paying for the first time in our history income taxes, and that money that is being received by the Federal Treasury, which is approximately \$1 billion per year, is from the corporations that are doing business in Puerto Rico. This is a new tax which was not paid before this year, and that money is not being received back by Puerto Rico at all.

So, Mr. Chairman, from that money there is sufficient monies to be given to Puerto Rico, but we are not being treated fairly, and all I am asking my fellow Members, Mr. Chairman, all I am asking is 3 cents per child per month so that the children of Puerto Rico can have a better opportunity of education. That is all I am asking.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the nays appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 340, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

AYES—76

Abercrombie	Hamburg	Reynolds
Ackerman	Hilliard	Richardson
Andrews (ME)	Jefferson	Romero-Barceló
Becerra	Johnson, E. B.	(PR)
Bishop	Kennedy	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackwell	Kennelly	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Clayton	Manton	Schumer
Clyburn	McDermott	Scott
Collins (MI)	McKinney	Serrano
Conyers	Menendez	Smith (IA)
de Lugo (VI)	Mfume	Stark
Deutsch	Mink	Stokes
Diaz-Balart	Mollohan	Tejeda
Engel	Murphy	Thompson
Faleomavaega	Nadler	Torres
(AS)	Norton (DC)	Underwood (GU)
Fazio	Obey	Unsoeld
Fields (LA)	Oliver	Velazquez
Filner	Ortiz	Vento
Flake	Owens	Waters
Foglietta	Pallone	Watt
Frank (MA)	Pastor	Wheat
Gekas	Payne (NJ)	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Pelosi	Wynn
Gutierrez	Rangel	Young (AK)

NOES—340

Allard	Chapman	Frost
Applegate	Clement	Furse
Archer	Clinger	Gallegly
Armey	Coble	Gejdenson
Bacchus (FL)	Coleman	Gephardt
Bacchus (AL)	Collins (GA)	Geren
Baessler	Combest	Gibbons
Baker (CA)	Condit	Gilchrest
Baker (LA)	Cooper	Gillmor
Ballenger	Coppersmith	Gilman
Barca	Costello	Gingrich
Barcia	Cox	Glickman
Barlow	Coyne	Goodlatte
Barrett (NE)	Cramer	Goodling
Barrett (WI)	Crane	Gordon
Bartlett	Cunningham	Goss
Barton	Danner	Grams
Bateman	Darden	Grandy
Beilenson	Deal	Greenwood
Bentley	DeFazio	Gunderson
Bereuter	DeLauro	Hall (OH)
Berman	DeLay	Hall (TX)
Bevill	Derrick	Hamilton
Bilbray	Dickey	Hancock
Bilirakis	Dicks	Hansen
Bliley	Dingell	Harman
Blute	Dixon	Hastert
Boehlert	Dooley	Hayes
Boehner	Doolittle	Hefley
Bonilla	Dorman	Hefner
Borski	Dreier	Herger
Boucher	Duncan	Hinchey
Brewster	Dunn	Hoagland
Brooks	Durbin	Hobson
Browder	Edwards (CA)	Hochbrueckner
Brown (CA)	Edwards (TX)	Hoekstra
Brown (FL)	Ehlers	Hoke
Brown (OH)	Emerson	Holden
Bryant	English	Horn
Bunning	Eshoo	Hoyer
Burton	Evans	Huffington
Buyer	Everett	Hughes
Byrne	Ewing	Hunter
Callahan	Farr	Hutchinson
Calvert	Fawell	Hutto
Camp	Fields (TX)	Hyde
Canady	Fish	Inglis
Cantwell	Ford (MI)	Inhofe
Cardin	Fowler	Inslee
Carr	Franks (CT)	Istook
Castle	Franks (NJ)	Jacobs

Johnson (CT)	Meyers	Schenk
Johnson (GA)	Mica	Schroeder
Johnson (SD)	Michel	Sensenbrenner
Johnson, Sam	Miller (CA)	Shaw
Johnston	Miller (FL)	Shays
Kanjorski	Mineta	Shepherd
Kaptur	Minge	Shuster
Kasich	Moakley	Sisisky
Kildee	Molinari	Skaggs
Kim	Montgomery	Skeen
King	Moorhead	Skelton
Kingston	Moran	Slattery
Klecza	Morella	Slaughter
Klein	Murtha	Smith (MI)
Klink	Myers	Smith (NJ)
Klug	Neal (MA)	Smith (OR)
Knollenberg	Neal (NC)	Smith (TX)
Kolbe	Nussle	Snowe
Kopetski	Oberstar	Solomon
Kreidler	Orton	Spence
Kyl	Oxley	Spratt
LaFalce	Packard	Stearns
Lambert	Parker	Stenholm
Lancaster	Paxon	Strickland
Lantos	Payne (VA)	Studds
LaRocco	Penny	Stump
Laughlin	Peterson (FL)	Stupak
Lazio	Peterson (MN)	Sundquist
Leach	Petri	Swett
Lehman	Pickett	Swift
Levin	Pickle	Synar
Levy	Pombo	Talent
Lewis (CA)	Pomeroy	Tanner
Lewis (FL)	Porter	Tauzin
Lightfoot	Portman	Taylor (MS)
Linder	Poshards	Taylor (NC)
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Livingston	Pryce (OH)	Thomas (WY)
Lloyd	Quillen	Thurman
Long	Quinn	Torkildsen
Lowey	Rahall	Torricelli
Machtley	Ramstad	Trafficant
Maloney	Ravenel	Tucker
Mann	Reed	Upton
Manzullo	Regula	Valentine
Margolies-	Ridge	Visclosky
Mezvinsky	Roberts	Volkmer
Markay	Roemer	Vucanovich
Matsui	Rogers	Walker
Mazzoli	Rohrabacher	Walsh
McCandless	Rose	Waxman
McCloskey	Roth	Weldon
McCollum	Roukema	Whitten
McCrery	Rowland	Williams
McCurdy	Royce	Wilson
McHale	Sabo	Wise
McHugh	Sanders	Wolf
McInnis	Sangmeister	Wyden
McKeon	Santorum	Yates
McMillan	Sarpalius	Young (FL)
McNulty	Sawyer	Zeliff
Meehan	Saxton	Zimmer
Meek	Schaefer	

NOT VOTING—22

Andrews (NJ)	Ford (TN)	Rostenkowski
Andrews (TX)	Gallo	Schiff
Bonior	Green	Sharp
Collins (IL)	Hastings	Thornton
Crapo	Houghton	Towns
de la Garza	Martinez	Washington
Dellums	McDade	
Fingerhut	Natcher	

□ 1313

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Collins of Illinois for, with Mr. Bonior against.

Messrs. HERGER, NEAL of Massachusetts, KLEIN, HUFFINGTON, GORDON, and ROWLAND changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Chairman, due to official business with constituents visiting Washington, DC, I was away from the House of Representatives at 12:43 p.m., March 3, when the vote was taken on the Romero-Barceló amendment to H.R. 6. Unfortunately my pager malfunctioned and failed to indicate that a vote was being taken. As a result, I was not present to cast my vote on this occasion. Had I been present at 12:43 p.m., I would have voted "no" on the Romero-Barceló amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHNER

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOEHNER: Beginning on page 190, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 13 on page 194 (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to eliminate the Elementary School Innovative Transitional Projects Program. But before I speak directly on this program, I would like to outline what Mr. MILLER from Florida and myself will try to do throughout the consideration of this bill.

We will be offering amendments to streamline the ESEA by eliminating several programs. Some of them have been recommended for elimination by President Clinton, not only in his proposal for the reauthorization of ESEA, but also in his recent budget. Some of them are so targeted in their focus that they can't possibly address broad, national educational concerns. Some of them can be funded by other larger programs and don't require their own separate authorization. And still others have the Federal Government getting into areas traditionally left to the States.

As the ESEA stands today, there are 61 programs. Some with large authorizations and many others with small authorizations and even smaller appropriations. There is no focus and priorities are lost. That is why many of us on the Education and Labor Committee started on a path to consolidate all of these programs into a set which not only was focused, but also made clear our priorities. Instead of having a large number of small pots of money, we would have a small number of large pots. These programs would in turn be focused and give school districts the flexibility to use the funding for their needs.

Even the Clinton administration got into the act with their initial proposal which consolidated some programs and eliminated others. Their proposal recommended the authorization of 26 programs. However, as the bill now stands, there are almost 48.

Unfortunately, some of these programs will end up taking funding away

from larger ones, such as title I and chapter 2. What is going to happen when the Appropriations Committee looks at this potpourri of programs and can't figure out our priorities? They will try to fund all of the programs in amounts too small to carry out their various objectives.

Mr. MILLER and I want to return focus to this bill and make for a more efficient use of taxpayer money. If these amendments are accepted, our schools will be better served, and ultimately, our children will be better served.

Which brings me to the present amendment. Since 1967, there has been a program called Follow Through, which is intended to sustain the gains made in Head Start and other preschool programs. But, as President Clinton described in his budget, "It was intended as a short-term experimental effort. Successful models have now been designed, refined, and disseminated for more than 25 years. The reauthorized title I grants to LEA programs will provide a more appropriate vehicle for funding implementation of these models."

The program before us is an extension of the Follow Through Program. While supporters of the program advocate that it is different, I submit that it is similar enough to Follow Through that it should be eliminated. In addition, the Secretary of Education will have to spend at least \$10 million on this program. In short, we are taking away the flexibility of title I and splitting that particular pot of money.

The administration proposed to eliminate Follow Through, and, frankly, this is nothing more than a backdoor attempt to ensure that the program continues. That is why we have a new title to the program.

Under the current Follow Through Program, approximately one-half of the grantees have had their grants for 20 years or more. This program started out as a demonstration project. However, there has been little growth in the program due to the fact that many of the original grantees still receive Federal support. There are no assurances that the same grantees will not receive funds under this new program in the bill.

In fiscal year 1991, the Department of Education funded 42 projects, 10 for sponsors, 30 for LEA's, and 2 research grants. The program gave priority to LEA projects operating in chapter 1 schools operating as schoolwide programs, and, as a result, 20 of the LEA grants were awarded to districts serving children in schoolwide projects.

The point we are trying to make here is that this is nothing more than a demonstration program that has gone on and on and on, and it is time to say "no." We can change the name. We can call a pig a cow, but that will not make it oink. The fact is, this is Follow

Through under disguise, and it ought to be eliminated from ESEA.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in opposition to the Boehner amendment, striking the Innovative Elementary School Projects. In response to the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] as to what our priorities are, in my view there is nothing more vital to our national security than how we educate our children.

This is part of the work that has been done in H.R. 6, particularly in title I, to ensure that our children are going to have the best education possible and that they are going to be able to succeed.

This program allows schools receiving title I funds to create and implement innovative transition projects to help at risk preschool children in Head Start, Even Start, and other preschool programs come to school prepared to learn.

It provides \$10 million in assistance under this section of the bill that deals with Federal evaluations and demonstrations under title I.

Now, we all know the importance of intervening early with our at-risk children. That is the entire purpose behind such programs as Head Start and Even Start. But we know by now that 1 year of preschool is just not enough. We have got to continue to support those children and their families as they move from one system to another. This is one important way we can encourage schools to focus their energy and their resources on helping Head Start and Even Start children to enter school ready to learn and to stay ready to learn.

This is not a Follow Through Program. This is a new authority that provides grants to LEA's for innovative transition projects. In order to be funded under this authority, projects must enter into formal transition agreements with Head Start, Even Start, and other local preschool programs, and they must involve parents in the planning, operation, and evaluation of transition projects.

We need to support these young children early in their education. Research indicates that without this support in those early years, we can expect increased school failure, higher drop-out rates, all of which are far more costly in the long run. This is a means of saving money in the long run, by keeping these children in school so that they can contribute to society rather than out of school and become dependent upon society.

One of the ways to reform welfare is to help children succeed in school. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Boehner amendment to title I.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to Representative BOEHNER's amendment to H.R. 6, Improving America's Schools Act of 1994. The Boehner amendment would eliminate funding for the innovative elementary school transitional projects.

The elementary school transitional projects are extremely important in helping children from low-income families who were part of a Head Start, Even Start, or a similar preschool program make a smooth transition to kindergarten and the early elementary grades.

Let us bear in mind that more than \$20 billion is being spent on Head Start and Even Start. The innovative elementary school transitional projects ensure that investment and its effectiveness.

Mr. Chairman, many gains have been made for children enrolled in Head Start and Even Start, but studies have shown that if we don't follow through with these children they fall behind. That is why the innovative elementary school transitional program is so essential.

I have introduced an amendment to this bill which would allow the use of mentors who are high school or college students trained to provide tutoring to elementary and secondary students formerly enrolled in Head Start or Even Start programs. Mentoring is just one example of the different types of transitional projects that can be initiated under this program.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Boehner amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

If we truly expect to meet our first national education goal, that all children shall enter school ready to learn, then preschool transition programs are absolutely essential.

Study after study has shown that the early school years are crucial in setting the stage for future academic success. We have all seen the benefits of Head Start and other early childhood programs that help low-income children start elementary school on an equal footing with their more economically advantaged peers.

However, Mr. Chairman, research indicates that the advantages of Head Start fade around third grade. Mr. Chairman, we must support these students during their first years of elementary school if we want them to maintain the gains they made during their preschool years.

The preschool transition program in H.R. 6 is designed to target children who are most educationally at risk. If we are concerned about school failure; if we want to lower the school drop-out rate; and if we want to increase the number of students who graduate with

the skills we will need for tomorrow's technological workplace; we must support the preschool transition program.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Boehner amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. I rise in opposition to this amendment. I think the whole amendment fundamentally misperceives the nature of our reauthorization.

What we are trying to do is take what we have learned over the last several years and incorporate it into this legislation. One thing we have learned is that young people who have been exposed to preschool programs like Head Start lose their advantage over the years, unless adequate comprehensive and thorough transition programs, all of the money that is being spent, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] indicated, is really dissipated, because we cannot sustain that level of performance.

At the heart of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] is a very sensible and very pragmatic approach, which is to invest in the types of transitional programs which will sustain what we have achieved through Head Start. We are going to once again, I hope, vigorously support Head Start. But to do so without this transitional mechanism is, I think, to be somewhat misplaced in our priorities. So we have to, I think, support this amendment.

The gentlewoman from Washington is right. We have to sustain the progress we have made through Head Start.

Also this program is not antagonistic to the administration's proposals. It is part and, indeed, complements the demonstrations of innovative practices programs which have been proposed by the administration.

□ 1330

On policy grounds, on commonsense grounds, this amendment should be defeated. We should retain the program of the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, because I have such respect for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], I rise to oppose the amendment which would eliminate title I transition projects. Over the past year the Subcommittee on Labor-Health and Human Services-Education of the Committee on Appropriations has demanded of the administration greater accountability for the education programs we fund.

We know that Head Start dollars, for instance, are simply being lost because

in the transition to elementary school, children lose the gains they have made in Head Start by the third grade.

Mr. Chairman, I know that transition programs can work. I have seen it in my own district at the Carmen school, in Waukegan where children get transition assistance. They do not have the Head Start fade. Their students maintain high achievement throughout the elementary grades. I invite anyone who questions the value of transition programs to look at the letters I get from these kids. Their ability to write as well as they do is eloquent testimony to their transition program.

Normally, I would be down here with Mr. BOEHNER, supporting a consolidation or termination of these programs. But, Mr. Chairman, I have been a strong supporter of transition programs from the beginning because they have proven their effectiveness. They work.

Congress allocates over \$3 billion a year on Head Start to give economically disadvantaged students the opportunity to start school ready to learn. Transition programs ensure the Head Start money is not wasted and that students continue to achieve at higher levels throughout elementary school.

I want to make an important point. This is an authorization bill and will not add to the deficit. The bill will not raise spending caps. But it will give the Appropriations Subcommittee the opportunity, without adding more money to total spending, to strike the proper balance between preschool and transitional assistance to ensure that billions of taxpayer dollars are not wasted on an ineffective program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to allow the Appropriations Subcommittee the flexibility of working between Head Start and transitional assistance, to fund children able to start school ready and able to learn.

Without the transitional programs, much of the Head Start money will simply not do the job. I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to take the full time. There is so much of what was needed to be said that has been said.

Let me just suggest, however, that I understand the motive of the gentleman from Ohio. I think it is well-motivated. If this in fact were a follow-through program, we would not want to sustain cash cows that simply went back to the same programs year after year, if that were what we were doing.

I do not believe that that is the case in this instance. Rather, this is a case of having learned the lessons of 23 years and more of programs as widely and highly regarded as Head Start, and innovative programs as essential to

sustaining that effort as Even Start, and to put them together in a way that lets them sustain the effort that they have begun, not only through a child's early school years, but from generation to generation.

The truth is that much of what we say about Head Start is absolutely true, but the program is not without its faults. It does not have the longevity we all would like to see. It does not have the sustainability we all would like to see.

However, we have learned lessons in recent years from the best of the followthrough programs and from others, like one in my district, the Decker Family Care Center, in which programs across school boundary lines bridge together Even Start, Head Start, health care programs from a variety of different kinds of settings, and sustain the strength of a family at the point where it is most fragile.

In fact, this was a program, the Decker Family Care Center, that was one of only a handful which, under the successful literacy demonstration programs in this country, was recognized by the First Lady. I hasten to add, it was not the current First Lady who recognized this, but the previous First Lady, who brought this program to national attention.

We need to be able to learn from this kind of effort. We need to be able to take those lessons and sustain them where they can grow. That is what this particular effort does. The title I transition projects do not represent an enormous amount of money, but they do represent the glue, the mortar, to hold together some solid bricks, some real building blocks that can build an edifice of a kind we care deeply about.

In that sense, while it is a matter of sympathy for me, that I understand the motive in making sure that we do not dissipate and diffuse already scarce dollars in the programs that we have, I stand here in opposition to the so-called Boehner amendment on the grounds that this is not the diffusion of dollars, these dollars represent the glue to hold together much larger programs that need the sustainability that it offers.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me just add a few remarks to what has been said, the words that have been said by some of my colleagues who are in opposition to the amendment before us.

In California we spend about \$4,200 per year to keep a child in school. We spend \$32,000 to keep a youth the same age locked up in a youth facility if he or she has committed a crime. When we consider that 80 percent of all the prisoners in our jails and prisons are school dropouts, it becomes very, very easy to understand why we want to have programs like Head Start, and

then have the transition programs once the child is no longer in Head Start but has moved on to school.

What we want to try to do is provide this child not just with the initial step to help any child who may be at risk with the opportunity to really learn and be productive once he or she becomes an adult, but really, once they are in school, to provide them with the assistance and that support that explains to them in very graphic terms that we are not going to let them fall between the cracks.

We do not want them to become part of the 80 percent that goes on to or is in prison. We also do not want them to become part of those that are costing us, as taxpayers, \$32,000 per year to keep them behind bars.

We have to do some things and we have to do them early so they do not cost us that much. We have to do what we can to use prevention methods and not remedial methods with kids who are starting to show signs of not being able to succeed in school.

I would hope that we would take a close look at these, particular projects that are funded by the transition projects under title I and understand that what we are doing is, we are paying pennies to keep these kids from becoming part of the 80 percent that are behind bars right now. Therefore, I would urge all my colleagues to please oppose this amendment and let us move on.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of the reauthorization process last year, there was a bipartisan effort to target scarce Federal dollars on title I and other programs focusing on broad national education concerns, rather than on specific constituencies.

We hoped to eliminate or consolidate numerous categorical programs and use the savings to create better education opportunities for all students.

During committee markup that concept was forgotten. Programs were reinstated which were originally eliminated not only in the President's reauthorization proposal, but also in his recent budget proposal. President Clinton called many of the programs worthy of termination or unneeded.

Rather than follow the President's recommendations, the committee added many brandnew programs. We believe that the House should return to the original intention and eliminate the \$1.8 billion of new programs as well as the \$62 million of programs targeted for elimination by the President.

We must begin eliminating and consolidating somewhere. The Innovative Elementary School Transition Project, formerly referred to as the Follow Through Program, should be eliminated.

I agree with my colleague from Ohio, Mr. BOEHNER, and the President in this case.

The Follow Through Program, in theory, is a noble idea, but the time has come to set priorities on Federal spending.

President Clinton and Secretary Riley have set priorities and I believe we need to do the same.

Authorizing \$10 million for a program targeted for elimination doesn't make sense. That's \$10 million to be divided over 15,000 school districts. I question the impact that so few dollars have?

The President called this program a short term experimental effort and pointed out that title I grants "will provide a more appropriate vehicle for funding implementation." I think we should show our support of the President and eliminate this program.

I would also like to point out the irony that today, we're marking up the 1995 budget in the Budget Committee. Our goal is to eliminate 115 programs targeted by the President. Meanwhile, this bill adds \$10 million here and another \$350 million in title II and \$200 million in title XI. The list goes on reaching \$1.86 billion of unwarranted spending.

We have got to start eliminating and consolidating somewhere.

We have got to draw the line.

The President drew the line when he targeted this program for elimination. I implore the Members to join the President and Mr. BOEHNER and pick up a piece of chalk and let us draw the line.

□ 1340

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for speaking and for yielding on this important issue. The gentleman and I do not have any beef with the program, and if Members want to do the program in their districts, more power to them, because obviously in some cases it has worked, although with Even Start the statistics are in and children are not falling behind as a result. So we have no beef about the program.

What the beef is is about a program that is so narrowly targeted that only 30 school districts in America receive benefit for it. All of this talk we heard on the floor this afternoon would lead one to believe this was a large nationwide project. But the fact is that what we have heard from today are Members who happen to have a grantee, one of these 30 grantees in their districts. I do not blame them for standing up on the floor here defending the program, trying to keep that money coming into their districts.

We are all familiar with pork in Congress. We all think it all happens in the

appropriations bills, but it does not. This is nothing more than educational pork that ends up in 30 school districts in America. When we are trying to focus some attention on how to help disadvantaged children in title I, this is the last thing that we ought to be doing—taking out an authorization for \$10 million in order to benefit just 30 school districts in America. That is my problem. It is not the program in general. I think districts and communities can afford to fund this program on their own. But for the Federal Government to do this for 30 districts is wrong, because what it does is it does this: It reduces the pie for all other school districts in America. And so for the 30 Members of Congress who have a grantee in their district, it may be great. But for the other 405 Members of Congress who receive nothing out of this, their districts end up getting less for their schools as a result of these types of very targeted programs.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. All of us who have followed the progress of education in America realize how important it is to begin the educational process in the earliest possible years. And because that has become almost a universally accepted educational policy in America, we have given in the Congress and throughout this country extraordinary support to Head Start programs and other preschool programs, because we realize that in particular for those communities that are at risk, have a tremendous percentage of poor children or poor families who are in some way economically disadvantaged, that if we are to help the children in these communities we have to start at the earliest possible age.

So we have embarked upon Head Start programs and we continue to insist that the goal of this country be to fully fund Head Start and to have it not only a half-day program but a full-day program as well as throughout the 12-month year.

In concert with our commitment to support the youngest of our children in Head Start programs and Even Start programs and others, we also believe that the gains that are made through Head Start and through early childhood education must have a transition process into the regular school program. And if we do not have this transition process much of what is gained in the preschool years will be lost.

So, my colleagues, this is an important part of the total concept of elementary and secondary education for children that are in the poverty area.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. MINK. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I fear that the sponsor of this amendment is not desiring to respond to his own colleagues about the need to not waste the \$20 billion that is already being spent on Head Start and Even Start by failing to sustain the progress of these students and has unfortunately resorted to calling this pork. It is an insurant and an investment that we are already making in at-risk children so that they will be able to succeed in school.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, if this was such an important program, why would not President Clinton have proposed in his recent budget that this program continue? And why would he, when he proposed the reauthorization of the elementary and secondary and vocational education, why would he not then have proposed that this program continue? The fact is that he did not propose in either his budget or in his reauthorization bill that this program continue.

Mrs. MINK. I have to respond to the gentleman that he has directed the question to someone who is not in full agreement with the President on many of his education initiatives, and in this particular one I think grievous error and failure of recognizing the importance of such programs that did provide a transition from early childhood education into the regular school. There may have been programs with followthrough, but this is not followthrough. This is a new program which attempts to enlarge upon and expand the opportunities for at-risk children, and in fact I believe concurs with the President's Goals 2000 which says the No. 1 goal is that all children shall enter school ready to learn.

That is really what this is all about. Why spend billions of dollars on Head Start with a comprehensive approach to education and then not have a program which affords extra support for transition in the at-risk school? We are not dictating policy. This is a voluntary approach which school districts are going to have the opportunity to avail themselves of. Only some of them may not like it, but I am sure in the gentleman's district as well as mine this opportunity to continue the advances and advantages of Head Start will be a very welcomed approach.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and I do so for two reasons.

First of all, I think that in an effort to save us \$10 million, this will ultimately cost us more money, both in terms of complementing, first, the Head Start Program, and second, crime preventing. And let me address both of those.

The Committee on Education and Labor will shortly reauthorize the Head Start Program. We have already conducted many thorough studies about where Head Start, a bipartisan-supported program, is good and strong, and where it might have some weaknesses. One of its perceived weaknesses is in following up on the knowledge that we give these children in Head Start Programs through preschool programs and entering into elementary school.

This program is designed to complement and provide a transition for those at-risk children and for those children that need, through a paucity or some weaknesses in the Head Start Program, some supplemental education and followup. So this will complement our Head Start Program, and hopefully keep children in school.

Second, many Members in this body are going to vote for a tough crime bill. Three strikes and you are out is going to be considered, reforms in habeas corpus and the exclusionary rule, and death penalty provisions expanded. I intend to vote for many of those provisions.

□ 1350

But we will be remiss in this body if we do not provide crime prevention programs as well, and invest in our children.

When I was in Indiana looking at our State budget for new prisons and new prison cells, I asked the director of prisons, "How do we calculate how many new prisons and prison cells we are going to build in the State of Indiana?" He said, "Mr. ROEMER, hold on to the seat of your pants. The single biggest variable, the barometer we look at, is the number of at-risk children in the second grade."

If we do not do enough on the crime bill or in this very important education bill, we will really be letting our taxpayers down. We will be telling them it is OK to spend \$30,000 to incarcerate and imprison people, but we do not want to spend some money on keeping our children in school and from the danger of dropping out.

I think that this amendment should be defeated. I think this will save us money both in terms of a crime bill, in terms of preventive education, and in terms of saving money for special services education, and I strongly encourage my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROEMER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. As I said earlier, I do not have any problem with the objectives that the Members who put this language in here are trying to accomplish. The problem is that it is only \$10 million. It is not a problem that is going to help in transition for all peo-

ple involved in Head Start, or Even Start, across the country. It is not anywhere near enough money.

Mr. Chairman, it would take hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars to accomplish that.

Second, it looks like the old Follow Through Program. There are no guarantees in the legislation that those grantees, those 30 grantees—20 of which who have been receiving money for over 20 years as part of the demonstration project—there is no grant or guarantees that they will not in fact continue to receive the same amounts of money that they have in the past.

So I understand your concern. But I say this to you: This is a very targeted program to help 30 school districts in America, and that is not why we are here reauthorizing this bill.

Mr. ROEMER. Reclaiming my time, which I do not have a lot of left, I would say this needs to be targeted. This need to be targeted to at-risk children who will drop out if not provided with the Follow Through assurances in this kind of transition program, who will cost us \$30,000 as opposed to several hundred dollars invested in children early on.

As the gentleman from Ohio knows, we are going to spend several billion dollars on crime prevention or on crime and on prisons and on putting more police on the streets, which we should be doing.

We have an obligation to future generations to invest in the crime prevention part, and that is what this transition program does.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the subcommittee, I feel very much like an orchestra leader.

All of the Members opposing this amendment have presented a very good concern against it.

I urge its defeat.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDEE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I sit on your subcommittee, and you do a wonderful job. I have to ask you this question: Do you currently have a school district in your congressional district that receives funding under the Follow Through Program?

Mr. KILDEE. Yes, I do.

Mr. BOEHNER. Would you think that with this new authorization that that school district would continue to receive funding?

Mr. KILDEE. I have no idea. They will have to compete with every other school district applying. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do this only to point out that our great flaw in Head Start

over a 20-year period, and at a cost of approximately \$20 billion, has been the fact that we have done nothing until the last reauthorization to deal with the family literacy problem.

The whole idea in Head Start, unfortunately, was to involve parents in everything other than learning about parenting, other than improving their literacy skills. The unfortunate part about this is that there is then no one at home to be the first and most important teacher that a child ever has.

That is why, when they get to third grade, contrary to what those who support Head Start usually like to say—that it is the school district's fault—the reason these children have problems is that we did not design the program well and did not insist that family literacy was a part of that program.

A second problem is that over the years since Head Start began, we have never recomputed a Head Start Program. I mean, even though the reports were such that we should have been doing something, we did not. We just allowed the same group to continue and continue and continue, and it became an employment program for them. It was their employment program, and they did not want us to mess with them. And so I think we really have to, as we go through this whole exercise, really zero in on the whole idea of family literacy, or we can spend \$20 billion more on Head Start, and those disadvantaged youngsters are still going to be disadvantaged, more disadvantaged, or at least not any better than those that went through the Head Start Program before them.

I will do anything I can do to make sure we do not come back with this argument against Head Start in the future. The chairman knows I have made this criticism about Head Start over and over again. We have to make very, very sure the same people do not constantly receive the grants year after year unless they are doing a good job.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Mr. BOEHNER's amendment to strike "Title I—Transition Projects" which are currently authorized under H.R. 6, the Improving America's Schools Act.

The legislation authorizes Federal assistance for comprehensive projects that provide for a smooth transition for children from preschool through the early elementary school grades. The projects target poor children, assisting them in reaching high academic standards.

These transition programs are vital in continuing the social and educational successes of those children participating in Head Start, Even Start, and other quality preschool programs through the early grade levels. The fade-out effect, seen in former Head Start participants, may be alleviated through the continuation of effective services for at-risk children during the elementary school grades.

Certainly, the continuation of innovative and successful preschool transition programs will prove to be a cost-effective and practical ap-

proach in the long run. If the educational and social needs of our youngest students are permitted to be neglected, the costs to society in the future through added demands on our education, justice, and social service programs will be enormous.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Boehner amendment and support the "Title I—Transition Program."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 128, noes 292, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

AYES—128

Allard	Fowler	Mica
Archer	Franks (CT)	Miller (FL)
Armey	Franks (NJ)	Minge
Bachus (AL)	Gallely	Moorhead
Baker (CA)	Gekas	Myers
Baker (LA)	Geren	Nussle
Ballenger	Gingrich	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Glickman	Packard
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Paxon
Barton	Goss	Penny
Bateman	Grams	Peterson (MN)
Bilbray	Greenwood	Petri
Bliley	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Boehner	Hancock	Portman
Bonilla	Hansen	Pryce (OH)
Bunning	Hastert	Quillen
Burton	Hefley	Ramstad
Buyer	Herger	Ravenel
Callahan	Hobson	Roberts
Canady	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Cardin	Hoke	Roth
Castle	Hunter	Roukema
Clinger	Hutchinson	Royce
Coble	Hyde	Santorum
Collins (GA)	Inglis	Schaefer
Combest	Inhofe	Sensenbrenner
Condit	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Cox	Kanjorski	Shuster
Crane	King	Smith (MI)
Crapo	Kingston	Smith (OR)
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Deal	Kolbe	Solomon
DeLay	Kyl	Stearns
Dickey	Lehman	Stenholm
Doolittle	Lewis (FL)	Stump
Dornan	Linder	Talent
Dreier	Livingston	Thomas (CA)
Duncan	McCollum	Thomas (WY)
Dunn	McCrery	Walker
Emerson	McHugh	Weldon
Fawell	McInnis	Zeliff
Fields (TX)	McKeon	Zimmer
Fingerhut	McMillan	

NOES—287

Abercrombie	Blackwell	Clayton
Ackerman	Blute	Clement
Andrews (ME)	Boehlert	Clyburn
Andrews (NJ)	Borski	Coleman
Applegate	Boucher	Collins (MI)
Bacchus (FL)	Brewster	Conyers
Baesler	Brooks	Cooper
Barca	Browder	Coppersmith
Barcia	Brown (CA)	Costello
Barlow	Brown (FL)	Coyne
Barrett (WI)	Brown (OH)	Cramer
Becerra	Bryant	Danner
Bellenson	Byrne	Darden
Bentley	Calvert	de Lugo (VI)
Bereuter	Camp	DeFazio
Berman	Cantwell	DeLauro
Bevill	Carr	Dellums
Bilirakis	Chapman	Derrick
Bishop	Clay	Deutsch

Diaz-Balart	LaRocco	Romero-Barcelo
Dicks	Lazio	(PR)
Dingell	Leach	Ros-Lehtinen
Dixon	Levin	Rose
Dooley	Levy	Rowland
Durbin	Lewis (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Edwards (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Edwards (TX)	Lightfoot	Sabo
Ehlers	Lipinski	Sanders
Engel	Lloyd	Sangmeister
English	Long	Sarpalius
Eshoo	Lowey	Sawyer
Evans	Machtley	Saxton
Everett	Maloney	Schenk
Ewing	Mann	Schroeder
Faleomavaega	Manton	Schumer
(AS)	Manzullo	Scott
Farr	Margolies-	Serrano
Fazio	Mezvinsky	Sharp
Fields (LA)	Markey	Shays
Filner	Martinez	Shepherd
Fish	Matsui	Sisisky
Flake	Mazzoli	Skaggs
Foglietta	McCandless	Skeen
Ford (MI)	McCloskey	Skelton
Ford (TN)	McCurdy	Slattery
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Slaughter
Frost	McHale	Smith (IA)
Furse	McKinney	Smith (NJ)
Gedjenson	McNulty	Snowe
Gephardt	Meehan	Spence
Gibbons	Meek	Spratt
Glitchest	Menendez	Stark
Gillmor	Meyers	Stokes
Gilman	Mfume	Strickland
Gonzalez	Miller (CA)	Studds
Goodling	Mineta	Stupak
Gordon	Mink	Sundquist
Grandy	Moakley	Swett
Gunderson	Molinari	Swift
Gutierrez	Mollohan	Synar
Hall (OH)	Montgomery	Tanner
Hamburg	Moran	Tauzin
Hamilton	Morella	Taylor (MS)
Harman	Murphy	Tejeda
Hayes	Murtha	Thompson
Hefner	Nadler	Thorton
Hilliard	Near (MA)	Thurman
Hinchey	Neal (NC)	Torkildsen
Hoagland	Norton	Torres
Hochbrueckner	Oberstar	Torricelli
Holden	Obey	Towns
Horn	Oliver	Traffant
Houghton	Ortiz	Tucker
Hoyer	Orton	Underwood (GU)
Huffington	Owens	Unsoeld
Hughes	Pallone	Upton
Hutto	Parker	Valentine
Inslie	Pastor	Velazquez
Istook	Payne (NJ)	Vento
Jacobs	Payne (VA)	Visclosky
Johnson (CT)	Pelosi	Volkmer
Johnson (GA)	Peterson (FL)	Vucanovich
Johnson (SD)	Pickett	Walsh
Johnson, E.B.	Pickles	Waters
Kasich	Pomeroy	Watt
Kennedy	Porter	Waxman
Kennelly	Poshard	Wheat
Kildee	Price (NC)	Whitten
Kim	Quinn	Williams
Kleczka	Rahall	Wilson
Klein	Rangel	Wise
Klink	Reed	Wolf
Klug	Regula	Woolsey
Kopetski	Reynolds	Wyden
Kreidler	Richardson	Wynn
LaFalce	Ridge	Yates
Lambert	Romer	Young (AK)
Lancaster	Rogers	Young (FL)
Lantos		

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews (TX)	Hastings	Michel
Bonior	Jefferson	Natcher
Collins (IL)	Johnston	Rostenkowski
de la Garza	Kaptur	Schiff
Gallo	Laughlin	Taylor (NC)
Green	McDade	Washington

□ 1417

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Taylor of North Carolina for, with Mr. Gene Green of Texas against.

Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. RIDGE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. EMERSON, Mrs. ROUKEMA and Messrs. THOMAS of California, BILBRAY, LEHMAN, and HALL of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUNDERSON

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUNDERSON: Page 127, after line 21 insert:

"Subpart 3—Presidential Awards Program

"SEC. 1131. PRESIDENTIAL AWARDS PROGRAM.

"(a) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with the chairpersons and ranking minority members of the Committee on Education and Labor for the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate and educational leaders, develop a Presidential awards program that will recognize and provide a cash award to schools that excel in educating their students to high levels as defined by the National Education Goals and the standards certified by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council established under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

"(b) NOMINATIONS.—Schools recognized under this program will be selected by the Secretary from a list of nominees. Each State shall select a nominee to be submitted to the Secretary from among schools designated as distinguished schools under section 1119.

"(c) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall annually convene a panel of experts who will review nominated schools and select those who will receive awards. In addition to Presidential recognition, selected schools will receive a cash award which may be applied without restriction to enhance the educational programs in those schools or to provide cash awards to personnel in the school.

"(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subpart such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999.

Mr. GUNDERSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHARP). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERFECTING AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUNDERSON

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. GOODLING to the amendment offered by Mr. GUNDERSON: In the amendment to page 127, after line 21—add the following:

In section 1131, subsection (a)—

(1) strike "shall in consultation" and all that follows through "America Act" and insert "may develop a Presidential awards program that will recognize the person or corporation producing the best education game of the year."

(2) in subsection (b)—

Strike "Schools" and all that follows through "section 1119" and insert the following: "Games recognized under this program shall be selected by the Secretary from a list of nominees or applicants submitted by a panel of experts who convene annually at the request of the Secretary."

(3) In subsection (c) strike "nominated" and all that follows through "1999" and insert the following: "nominations and applicants in selecting recipients who will receive awards under this section. Games selected for awards under this section may be eligible to receive other awards."

Mr. GOODLING (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the perfecting amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] rise?

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

The perfecting amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROHRBACHER: Page 25, after line 18, insert the following:

"SEC. 1003. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

"None of the funds authorized in section 1002 shall be made available to a local educational agency unless—

"(1) such agency, beginning on October 1, 1994, and continuing on or before such date in each subsequent year, submits to the Assistant Secretary of Education for Elementary and Secondary Education, a statement regarding the total number of students enrolled in its school system, the number of students enrolled who are not lawfully in the United States, the number of students who are lawfully in the United States who do not have at least 1 parent or legal guardian who is lawfully in the United States, and the average per pupil expenditure of the local educational agency.

"(2) The data submitted under paragraph (1) shall be current as of any date in the 30-day period prior to the date that the Assistant Secretary requires."

□ 1420

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple, straightforward, and it ought to be noncontroversial. It simply requires schools receiving funding under title I of ESEA to count their students who are in this country illegally or those who have parents who are in this country illegally. This information, taken together with the information about the cost of education at the schools, will allow all levels of Government to determine the cost of illegal education to our country's school systems.

The reason I believe this amendment should be noncontroversial is that regardless of how one stands on the issue of Government benefits to illegal aliens, the debate should be based on the most accurate information possible about the cost to all levels of Government of the current policy, which is the policy of giving educational benefits to anyone who makes his or her way into this country, legally or illegally.

To those who believe that the Federal Government should provide such compensation to school districts with high levels of illegal immigrants, this amendment will provide them the data they need to determine the amount of money that is needed to be reimbursed. Those who believe, as I do, that Government should not provide education for illegal aliens and their children will also find it valuable to have these costs and the figures available. Whichever side one is on of the illegal issue, it is essential for Congress to know how much it is costing to educate illegal aliens and their children in this country.

Let me also explain, Mr. Chairman, what my amendment does not do. It does not create any great or unprecedented burden on the schools, although I am sure that is what my opponents will suggest. There is not a school in this country which does not have information for every student enrolled in its system. It is very easy to determine if the birth certificate comes from the United States or not, and those presenting birth certificates from other countries would simply be asked a further question about their legal status.

Under a number of Federal laws, the schools are already required to determine the occupation of the students' parents for impact purposes and the incomes of their parents for school lunch purposes. It is not out of line to ask, with very little expense, just an additional question about legal status.

Some Members of this House who are themselves responsible for imposing billions of dollars' worth of unfunded mandates on local school districts have decided to attack this minor requirement which would have very little cost to impact and attack it as an unfunded mandate. That is absolutely ridiculous, and just to remove any doubt, I will be

accepting an amendment to my amendment brought by the coauthors of the Congressional Unfunded Mandates Caucus, of which I am an original member. The gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] will be proposing an amendment that will take care of that particular problem, if it ever was a problem.

My amendment also does a couple of other things, and it does not do a couple of other things also. It does not require the reporting of any names of students or parents to the INS, although we will hear people making that charge. It does not require that, or that these names be transmitted to any other Federal agency. All we are asking for in this amendment is that we need the numbers, not the names. Nor does this amendment cut off any funds for educating illegal aliens. That is not what this amendment is about. I will be proposing an amendment like that separately later on, but that is not the point of this amendment.

Let me make note of the fact that asking for information does not violate in any way the Supreme Court's *Plyer* versus *Doe* decision. That decision deals with providing education, not with asking questions, so there is no prohibition on whether or not we can in some way come to grips with the illegal alien problem, with the numbers of illegal aliens that are in our schools and how much they cost us.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is merely an attempt to quantify these costs, the costs of educating illegal aliens and their children, something that everyone should agree is needed.

Let me say this very clearly. Those people who oppose this amendment and say that we should not even be able to count the number of illegal aliens in our schools should not come back to this body and expect that any money be provided by the Federal Government to finance the education of illegal aliens, if they themselves have refused to provide the data that is necessary to find out how many illegal aliens are needed to be financed. Any small burden that this amendment would require, that it would add in terms of the informational requirements that the schools already face, is just absolutely minimal, it far outweighs the benefits of knowing the information that we have to have. There is a huge unfunded mandate right now, and the number of illegal aliens, especially in the Southwest and California, that is providing a burden to the taxpayers to the point that the level of our schooling or the quality of our schooling is being stretched to the breaking point is such that we cannot permit this to go on and just ignore the issue. Let us quantify it, find out how much it is costing, and then we can determine what the solution should be.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROBERTS TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTS to the amendment offered by Mr. ROHRABACHER:

At the end of the amendment proposed to be added to page 25, after line 18, add the following:

"(3) The direct costs incurred by States, local educational agencies, and schools in complying with this section shall be reimbursed by the Federal Government.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] and other members of the Congressional Caucus on Unfunded Mandates.

After consulting with various Members on the language and the intent of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], it was agreed that this correcting amendment to his language should be and would be offered.

I wish to recognize the efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] to amend H.R. 6 in a way that hopefully would reduce costs to American taxpayers.

The simple language we are offering is intended to remove an additional unfunded mandate that would be created if the Rohrabacher language were adopted. Simply put, this language would require that the Federal Government fund the cost of this requirement if it were enacted.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the chairman of the Unfunded Mandates Caucus, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS]. I think it is imperative that when we in Congress determine that there is an unfunded mandate attached to a piece of legislation, or as in this case, an amendment, we find a way to pay for it. That is what we are trying to do with this amendment. We are trying to state clearly that if it costs local school districts money, the Federal Government is obligated and responsible to pay for that.

That is basically what we are doing today. I am in support of that, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] that would ask us to do that.

In addition to that, I would advise Members that we will be offering this amendment to other parts of H.R. 6. This is not something new. It is something we have debated, and it is something we will continue to do.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for an aye vote.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield very briefly to the gentleman from California.

□ 1430

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. My understanding is that his amendment is to say that the Federal Government shall pay for this program.

I have two questions. One is, how are we going to pay for that program, and the second one is if we do not pay for that program because we have passed a series of laws around here, unfortunately, where we have told local government we would pay for the program, and it has never happened, and yet they are still mandated to carry out the program.

We do that for education of the handicapped. We told them we would pay a percentage of excess costs. We never did that. They still have to educate handicapped children. What is going to happen here when this part is not funded?

Mr. ROBERTS. I think the gentleman is pointing out exactly why we are making this perfecting amendment. We are extremely concerned that, regardless of what we pass in this body, we are passing the costs on to the States and local government. If the Rohrabacher amendment is passed, if that does actually represent a de minimis kind of unfunded mandated cost, we are simply saying the Federal Government shall pay for it.

Mr. MILLER of California. We all know that is subject to appropriations.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would tell the gentleman that it comes under section 502 of the bill as it stands, it is subject to the provisions of the Committee on Appropriations. So the appropriations process would take care of it. I cannot tell you exactly where the money would come from.

Mr. MILLER of California. If they do not fund it, does the Rohrabacher provision drop out?

Mr. ROBERTS. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. MILLER of California. If they do not fund it, we are back to an unfunded mandate.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If the gentleman would yield, this whole question about cost is obviously a maneuver in order to defeat the purpose of the bill, rather than what I consider to be a substantial argument.

Mr. MILLER of California. It is talking about the merits. Somebody is going to have to talk about the costs.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I have the time. While I have great respect for the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], they can continue this debate under their own time.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS]. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] raises a very good question. When I first heard about the amendment, I put the gentleman on notice that I would have to make a point of order against the amendment because it would be establishing an entitlement. The gentleman went and checked, as I checked, and found out that indeed this is an entitlement. There is no guarantee that the States and local governments will ever get a nickel out of this language. It is mainly an authorization to appropriate money for that purpose. And if we never appropriate a nickel, the States and local communities will still have to put their money out, because if they do not put their money out to do this, they will not get money under this bill to educate the at-risk children in their school district from the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, there is a cutoff if they fail to gather the information, but there is no cutoff of the requirement to gather the information if they fail to get the money. And that is the very strange situation.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] can refer to it as a gimmick to oppose your amendment. I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment because it is insane to suggest that after what we learned about Nazi Germany in the period before World War II, that we would turn little children into informers on their parents as to their nationality status in schools in this country and expect that they would still go to school with trust in their eyes and trust in their hearts, when it was time for them to go to school.

It is insane in your attempt to make whatever point you wanted to make about illegal aliens. And I do not know what is going on in your part of California. I have never been able to figure it out. But I wanted to tell you something, it is not just going to affect them.

In the city of Detroit, there are tens of thousands of people who are in the school system and in surrounding suburbs who are Canadian citizens, and they never saw a green card. They do not know about those things, because they are not a different color and they do not speak a different language.

Where you have a population that is coming in that has a different skin coloration or a different language, it is easy to pick them out and identify the problem and demagog on that issue. I am not saying that the gentleman is doing that, but some have in the past.

What I want to tell the gentleman is that you are causing trouble for every school district in the country. You go into Miami and try to find out how you are going to get anybody to come to school, when the school has to turn in

the number of children who are illegal. Not only that, if the child is born in the United States and is legal, they have to bring information about mommy and daddy. And not since Adolf Hitler has any government asked little school children to tell on mommy and daddy.

Your amendment should be defeated with or without the amendment correcting it. And the amendment correcting it does not really do any good, because it does not guarantee that the school districts will ever get paid a dime.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Roberts amendment, because I think it is a subterfuge. If in fact what they were concerned about is unfunded mandates, what they would say is unless Federal moneys are provided for this activity, the activity shall not be required.

That is not what it does. In fact, what we do is, we say the Federal Government shall fund this, as we do throughout the entire bill. We know that we have the right as the Federal Government to pick and choose where we will spend taxpayers' dollars and where we do not, and that happens in the appropriations process.

But, in fact, the school district will be left with this charge in this legislation without the money. That is the history of unfunded mandates. So this amendment does not cure that problem.

I think it is a subterfuge to suggest that it does or that it takes somebody off the hook. Because let us read what the California school board's association says about this, a State that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] and I both represent.

They say, "It is with great frustration that we find the Federal Government attempting to address illegal immigration by further burdening the schools. Immigration policies and enforcement are strictly under the domain of the Federal Government, and yet schools have direct constitutional mandates to provide the educational services, regardless of whether or not the Federal Government has enforced those policies."

That is the law. That is what the constitutional case the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] pointed out said. And yet now we are telling them that whether or not we are effective in controlling immigration and enforcing the laws of this country, they will suffer another burden.

I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], that our governor was just back here in Washington explaining to us that is exactly what he did not want to have continue to happen. That is how he has added up a \$3 billion bill, saying that this is the unfunded cost of illegal immigration to the State of California. Now what the gentleman is suggesting is he is going to add to that.

So, the Roberts amendment is not a big enough fig leaf to cover the flaws in this amendment. There are other flaws that we will address when we get back to the Rohrabacher amendment. But to suggest that somehow the Roberts amendment takes care of unfunded mandates, the chairman of the caucus better go back to legislative counsel and draft one that in fact does that.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, If the gentleman will yield, I am wondering if the gentleman would accept a request on my part, a unanimous consent request, that would say something to the effect that requirements of this title, however, would be suspended if such reimbursement is not authorized by the Congress.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will have to work that out with the committee, the language. It has to be language that works, but that, in effect, says that when the Committee on Appropriations comes here, you can have that fight. But do not do this to the school districts that do not have the money. You have got to make that kind of link. And I do not know if that does it or not, and I am not objecting to it.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, is not the problem the gentleman is trying to articulate is that the money is actually appropriated under title I, and the net effect of the two amendments together will be that the first requirement of every State is to use their limited chapter 1 dollars to do a survey before they use any of the money for anything else, which is clearly not the intent of the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, it is a condition of the funding. What they point out is you are reducing the educational dollars to take care of now another problem you want local government to solve, which is not of their making. They do not create the immigration laws nor the enforcement policies in this country. The gentleman from Wisconsin is quite correct.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, what you are doing now is identifying another facet of the problem. If the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] has an objective here, he should attain that objective by amending the immigration laws and putting obligations on local police departments, school districts, whoever he wants to, providing that the money that we appropriate to enforce our immigration laws pay for it.

Do not take money that is so thinly spread now that we cannot do the job away from children who are being taught to read and compute math and use it for recordkeeping to do the INS's job for it. If they are going to work for the INS, let the INS pay for it. If you

want to do something about tightening up on immigration, let us do it with immigration legislation. Let us not try to use scarce school dollars to do that.

□ 1440

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it never ceases to amaze me how these debates get distorted, at least in my view. They have to get a lot of this information when students enroll in school anyhow. They have to provide birth certificates. They have to provide other information. They have to provide health information.

This is not a large additional cost. Yet they are using this, in my view, as a red herring to stop finding out what the real problem is.

In 1992 we spent \$13.2 billion on primary and secondary education for illegal aliens. In 1992, the estimated cost for illegal immigrants, for the period 1992 to 2002, will be \$221.5 billion. Yet every single time we come to this floor to try to get a handle on the illegal immigration problem, the liberal mentality says we cannot do that. Yet people across this country are concerned about their tax dollars being used wisely. They are concerned about the national debt. And yet one of the biggest expenditures we have that is adding to this deficit is taking care of illegal aliens coming across this border for health care purposes, educational purposes, and social purposes.

We will not even address the problem, because the liberals in this body continue to say, "Oh, my gosh, we cannot do that."

Let me give my colleagues some statistics that we will not address in this body. There are 2.3 million illegal aliens coming across the Mexican-American border alone every year, and about 1 million go back. That means we are getting 1.3 million new illegal aliens in this country that we are taking care of every single year with American taxpayers' dollars.

They are not paying taxes. They come in to get phony Social Security cards, phony drivers' licenses so they do not have to do that. And yet, we are picking up the tab. But we cannot deal with it, because the liberals in this body continue to say, "Oh, my gosh, that is something we can't do. You are going to hurt the children. You are going to hurt these poor people."

That is insane. The taxpayers who are paying the bill in this country ought to have some accountability from this Congress, and that means when illegal aliens come into this country, we ought to know how many of them there are. We ought to know where they are. We ought to know what benefits they are getting, and we ought to send them back where they came from, unless they are legally in this country.

Let me give my colleagues some other statistical data. Illegal aliens constitute one out of four people that are inmates in our Federal prisons. Each one of those inmates costs about \$85,000 a year that the taxpayers have to pay for, one-fourth of our prison population, but we cannot deal with that. We ought to talk to them about that.

There were 1,064 illegal aliens in the Los Angeles riots that did billions of dollars worth of damage. Those were not American citizens. They were illegal aliens breaking into those stores, carrying out television sets and everything else, 1,064 of them.

Two-thirds of the births in Los Angeles County last year or 37,000 births were illegal alien births, and the AFDC payments per month is \$26 million just to take care of those children and take care of their families. That did not include other forms of health care, education, or anything else. Yet we cannot get at the problem, because the liberals say we cannot do that.

If we look at every single bill that came before this body, the immigration bill, everything else, there is always a reason to say no, we cannot do that.

I say we ought to be accountable to the U.S. taxpayer that is footing the bill. These people are not American citizens. If they wanted to come through the normal immigration process, fine. But when they come into this country illegally, we have no obligation to take care of their health, their welfare, or their education. Yet we cannot talk to these Members. They say one is a Nazi, if they talk about that. Give me a break. Give me a break.

We ought to start thinking about the American taxpayer who is footing the bill. I could go on and on and on, because I have reams of statistical data to show we are spending billions and billions and billions of dollars, when we cannot afford it, when the national debt has grown from \$1 trillion 10 years ago, after 200 years, to \$4.5 trillion in 10 years.

We are taking care of the rest of the world, and we are neglecting the Americans that are paying the bill. I think that is wrong.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I was just going to point out that, as I understand it, the debate that has gone on here, we are trying to stop the sins of the past. There is no question we asked for a huge amount of information from school districts today, school lunch programs and others. We are also working overtime with school districts to try to reduce that paperwork, to reduce those costs so we can take that money and put it into lunches or services or teaching.

We cannot just say, because we are already doing that, we can just add a little bit more. I think that is the purpose of the debate that is going on here.

From this reauthorization, which has been 5 years since we have done it, if Members do not want unfunded mandates, then they have to come up with ways to provide that funding. We cannot just say this is additive. We are asking the questions anyway. This is an entirely different set of questions about citizenship than about whether the school lunch applies to a person or not.

I just say, let us cure the sin here, if that is what we are serious about doing.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHARP). The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, Governor Wilson, to whom the gentleman alluded a few minutes ago, has talked about the tremendous burden that has been placed upon him and his State, the State of California, the gentleman's State, in taking care of illegal aliens in every single area: health care, education, and so forth.

I submit to my colleagues that one of the ways to get to the bottom of the problem is to find out how many illegal aliens are in the schools and being taught. If we found that out, then they could find a way to address this problem through the educational system as well as health care, welfare, and everything else.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, apparently Governor Wilson knows, because he keeps sending us the bill here.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And he keeps complaining, and I think with justification. This Congress needs to take responsibility for not dealing with the illegal alien problem.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Part of my problem is, I agree in large part with the side on the committee and part of me agrees with the problem that we have in illegal immigration in the State of California.

I took a look at this thing on both sides of it, and I still do not know, although I am in support of the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER]. I do not know if it is going to do any good. I do not know what it is going to cost.

I have those same concerns on the other side. I also feel that the real problem needs to be solved at the border, not in the field of education.

I have a real hard time with it. But as was discussed a minute ago, Governor Wilson has asked for \$3.7 billion

because of the illegal immigration impact. It is a Federal mandate. We mandate on the States that they pay for it, just like we are trying to legislate that we mandate a payment to cover the cost of this paperwork.

The problem is, \$3.7 billion a year, if we can stop illegal immigration, we do not have to worry about doing it here in the field of education. We can take \$3.7 billion and apply it to those areas into education and law enforcement and the rest of it by stopping it at the border.

I think that is the real area that we need to take a look at. I want to stop all illegal immigration coming in, whether it is the Chinese boat people, whether it is the Irish, which I am a member of, or whether it is across the border of Mexico. The only way to do that, I think, is to stop totally those services, but that should not rest in the education field.

However, all the other areas, law enforcement, where we have, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] said, about 25 percent, it is actually about 132 percent of our felons are illegal aliens, but we do not fund that. We know that number. It is a hard number. And we can ask the Government for funds.

In the field of AFDC, we know that number. And we can do it.

But in the field of education, when the State asks for help because of the impact, just like impact aid in military, when the State asks for the numbers of illegals so that we can get the funding out of the Federal Government for that impact on the States, we cannot give them an accurate number.

My problem with the Rohrabacher amendment, one, it is an unfunded mandate, which I would like to see it funded. But we cannot appropriate it unless we authorize it first, or they will call for a point of order later on. So it is "darned if you do and darned if you don't."

The whole point is, my wife is a principal. We take a birth certificate. We take an address, and we take a phone number. And we do not ask the kids. The parents fill that out.

□ 1450

When the parent fills that out, you put block No. 4 on there, "Are you a legal resident of the United States?" That does not take a whole lot of paperwork or a whole lot of dollars to do. You cannot use that information by law with the INS, so you cannot verify it. I do not know if it is going to do any good or not.

That is what my problem is on both sides of this, trying to weigh in my own mind whether it is a good thing to do. I do not know if we are going to get accurate funds, but I think we need to stand up in all the committees and make a point. First of all, we are dealing with illegal immigration—illegal

immigration that impacts us, \$27 billion across the United States. We can do a lot with that money. If we stop that type of immigration, we are going to not only help taxpayers, but we are going to help the programs that we are so deficient in the money, in education, in law enforcement, in health care, and the rest of it.

The perfecting amendment I would hope that the Members would support. The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has 600 new border patrolmen at the border. They have lights, they have roads. That is where we need to stop illegal immigration.

My friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] and I will sit down and talk. They will support those kinds of initiatives. Do we do it in education?

The second amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] I oppose. Why? Because he is going to ask that the Federal Government not give the schools money, but yet, the school counts it by the number of faces there, and if they do not get the number of faces there, they cannot get the money. Again, Governor Wilson is going to have to pay for it, and he does not have the money to do that, so I would oppose the second amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

This amendment in essence, I think the point is just trying to identify the numbers. I think my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] would agree. We need to identify the numbers so we can get the money for it. I do not know if this is going to do it. I hope it does. That is one of the reasons I would support it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have represented an awful lot of migrant workers in the 24 years I have served in this House. I just have this observation. Local school districts do not set immigration policy, the Federal Government does. Local school districts do not have the responsibility to police America's borders, the Federal Government does.

National politicians for years have expressed concerns about the inability of local school districts to produce quality education. How many speeches have we heard from national politicians bemoaning the fact that schools spend so much on administration in comparison to how much they actually deliver in the classroom. Yet this amendment would add to the very problem those people bemoan. It tells local educational institutions that they ought to take precious resources which ought to be focused on educating children and instead divert those resources to producing more paper which they can send to the Federal Government and other administrative agencies of Government.

This amendment will not do anything to stop illegal immigration. It will simply impose added data-gathering burdens to no real positive purpose. It will probably discourage some immi-

grants from sending their kids to school out of fear of being reported.

Let me tell you what I resent as much as anything. In my home town, I have thousands of refugees. They place a great new burden on the local school district in my home county, but my home city and my home county did not establish the immigration policy under which they came to the United States, the Federal Government did. Yet the local districts are being left holding the bag in terms of costs. The Federal Government has welshed on its responsibility to provide support for those immigrants, and the Federal Government is certainly not meeting its responsibilities to local districts if they are asking local districts to turn schools into policing agencies because a Federal agency has not done its own job.

To me, the only real result of this amendment will be that it diverts needed resources from the classroom to administrative procedures, and it will, in the process, I think, help to increase polarization in local communities. I do not think either one of those developments would be constructive.

I would ask, what is the purpose of this amendment. Because if the purpose is today to provide data on the number of children in those districts, what is the next step going to be? Is the next step then going to be to withdraw Federal support from the school districts who happen to be teaching these kids. Is that going to be the next step? Does that not in turn leave the local district holding the bag?

It just seems to me that if we want to deal with immigration policy, do it on an immigration bill, do not do it on an education bill. We already demand far too much of our schools, besides providing an education. This is just another one of those demands. I do not believe it is constructive. I think Members ought to vote the amendment down.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we are hearing all kinds of arguments coming at this issue from all kinds of different directions. First we hear people say how terrible it is we are going to divert all sorts of resources at the local level away from education. Then we have people on the other side who are trying their darndest to prevent us from authorizing, which is exactly what we are trying to do with the so-called Roberts amendment, the money that is necessary to pay for this added cost, which is a minimal, minimal cost of people asking two more questions. Of all the other questions that they ask when a student has to register for class, we just ask two more questions.

As far as I am concerned, we have to be really up front right now about what we are talking about. We are talking about, in this language, the Roberts language, an authorization of the money. We just hear people on the floor saying that they are concerned that the local governments will have to spend. That is what this is, an authorization.

We also hear that we cannot, for example, by authorizing this money really be assured that the money is going to get there, because it is not appropriated. Come on. That means nothing in this bill has any meaning at all, because we do rely on the appropriators to appropriate the money. This is exactly where this kind of stand should be made. This is exactly

where the policy is made. We are stating the policy. We are making the authorization.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, the end cost is minimal, even to the Federal Government. I think the public, when they are listening to this debate, will understand we are being told, "You cannot do anything about the illegal immigration problem. Leave it to the Immigration and Naturalization Service." In my State, we know by providing tens of thousands of dollars worth of benefits, education, health benefits, housing benefits to illegal aliens, what we have done is enticed a flood of illegal immigration from all over the world into California, and it is breaking our bank.

Again, if Members defeat my amendment and this amendment, no one from California, from the Southwest, should come back to this body and say, "We need money to help take care of the education or health needs of illegal immigrants," because they have refused to permit us to set up a system where we can quantify the problem.

By the way, leaving it up to Immigration, we know it has not worked in California. We know it has not worked. They can build a wall 10 feet high, dig a trench 20 feet deep, and if we are giving a package of benefits to people to come here illegally, especially if it is aimed at helping their families, and these are good and decent people, we are not saying that the people who are coming here illegally, whether it is from Canada, as was suggested, in Michigan, or whether it is from Mexico, as many of the people from California are from Mexico, or from Asia, or from Europe, or from Ireland, these are not bad people coming here. We just cannot afford to spend tens of millions, hundreds of millions, billions of dollars educating people from other countries who are here illegally.

The bottom line is when we hear the other side of this argument, talking with all sorts of compassion about "we cannot waste the money to even determine the problem," the American people can understand what is going on. The American people are going to see that what we are being told is we cannot do anything about a problem that is draining billions of dollars out of our system, draining billions of dollars that should be going to provide education for our own kids, meaning kids of legal residents and U.S. citizens, and giving this money to provide benefits for the children of illegal aliens.

That is not to say that we do not like these children or that they are bad people. We have to care about our own people first.

Now, you can talk about all kinds of parliamentary maneuvers and things of why it cannot be done and use all of these words. The people back home will just know that what is happening is an attempt to prevent at least a first step of coming to grips with this problem. And that is, we have got to take down the welcome sign that says, "If you can get across this border, we are going to give you all kinds of benefits, the same benefits package that any American has," because we are inviting people to come, and the Immigration Service that you are talking about, you are saying let the Immigration Service do

it. I will tell Members, if we are providing this benefit, they are never going to be able to do that job, and you know they will never be able to do that job because we are giving people an incentive to break the law and come here.

I have supported legal immigration. This is not an anti-immigrant bill. This is an anti-illegal-alien move to try to stem this flow that is coming into our country and dissipating all of the funds that our people have saved up, whether it is retirement or whether it is health care, those people who come from our own country who have been here for a long time, legal residents and U.S. citizens and have contributed to the pot. We are about them. It is not that we are heartless.

For us to hear these words, "Nazi Germany," the American people do not buy that kind of name-calling anymore. They know it is a serious problem. It deserves serious discussion, and that is what this is all about.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote against this amendment, and I say that with an understanding of the gravity and importance of this problem.

The first duty of Government is to protect the safety of its citizens, and probably right along with that is the duty to protect the borders of the United States and to see that illegal immigration does not take place.

Like many of my colleagues in the chamber, I have been on the border many times, the Canadian border, and I have been to places like Miami, where illegal immigration occurs, and I have been on the border with Mexico. The truth is that we are not making a sufficient effort with the Immigration Service to make sure that illegal immigration does not take place.

Perhaps we need to bring the Immigration Service bill back up on this floor. Hopefully, it will come later in the year and we can have this discussion. I am prepared, and I think a lot of Members are prepared, to appropriate additional moneys to make sure that our borders are secure. I am convinced that we can do a far better job than we are doing.

I stood at the border at Tiajuana not long ago, and I watched illegal immigration take place. I talked to the immigration officers who were there, and they said, "Yes, we could do a much better job, but we are not prepared today to do it because we do not have the commitment of the U.S. Congress through funding sources to make possible what needs to be done."

I think this amendment is ill-advised. We are seeing this kind of amendment on a whole series of bills

before this House. Let us check on people that want to get into a training program, let us check on people that want to get into a school, let us check on people who want to do all manner of things that Government agencies that are outside the Immigration Service are not prepared to do. It does not make sense to turn every school and every school official in the country into an immigration officer. That is not their job. They are not prepared to do it. They do not have the equipment to do it, they do not have the personnel to do it, they do not have the time to do it, they do not have the ability to do it correctly? So let us please not burden every piece of legislation that comes through here with an added responsibility to enforce the immigration laws of this country. Let us get the immigration laws enforced by the Immigration Service and by the Border Patrol.

I was told by our immigration officers that earlier last year, when the Mexican Government and our Government got more serious about illegal immigration for about a 2-month period, illegal immigration dropped precipitously. It can be done. But let us do it in the right place, and let us have this discussion on an immigration bill that comes before this House, and let us keep the responsibility where it belongs, not in the schools and not in the training programs of this country, but in the Immigration Service, which has that responsibility.

I urge Members to vote against this amendment.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Roberts amendment because it really does not solve the problem of unfunded Federal mandates. It is merely a cosmetic cover.

There are presently not enough Federal funds to cover all of the programs that are being implemented.

Now, the Rohrabacher amendment creates a further requirement, and the Roberts amendment says, "Well, don't worry about it; the Feds will cover the cost." Oh, yeah, and the check is in the mail.

But, Mr. Chairman, I rise today mainly in opposition to the two Rohrabacher amendments which would require schools to identify and collect data on the residency status of students, and would withhold Federal funds for any district which does not comply with this bureaucracy.

As a certified teacher, I am sensitive to the education ramifications of such a damaging amendment, and as someone who came to the United States at an early age and learned English through a bilingual program, I cannot stress to my colleagues enough that we cannot allow this and other harmful amendments to pass today.

I am extremely concerned over the constitutional question raised by these amendments, which violate the Supreme Court mandate that public schools must provide education to all children regardless of their immigration status. The sponsors believe that the constitutional questions have been resolved. But I do not believe that this is so.

In addition to my opposition from a legal standpoint, I am also worried about the implications to blameless children and families who are citizens of the United States but who do not look like an antiquated version of what an "average American" may be, and who, therefore, may be susceptible to discrimination.

This amendment would cause an enormous paperwork burden for teachers and would require them to determine the INS status of their students. The administrative costs of this needless bureaucracy could very well be high.

Additionally, this notification serves no immigration policy because restricting students from education will not prevent illegal immigration. This amendment would provide bilingual programs in some districts which have proven to be powerful tools in helping limited-English-proficient students learn English. This increases the danger of students dropping out and not graduating. Hispanics have one of the highest drop-out rates in this country, and this legislation would only worsen the problem. We should not critically restrict the schools' capability to provide services to limited-English-proficient students to areas such as Miami, with a great number of such students.

The U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Services also oppose these amendments, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's cosmetic reference to my amendment. However, I think the cosmetics are in error as far as my personal intent.

The gentlewoman indicated the check is not in the mail, and that is precisely the reason that I introduced this amendment. On behalf of the unfunded mandates caucus, it was determined when Mr. FORD went to Mr. CONDIT and said will you please help us here because the Rohrabacher amendment has an unfunded mandate, as to why he is on the floor is because it is precisely because Mr. ROHRABACHER came to me and said it might be an unfunded mandate, would you come to the floor. I have not really indicated my prejudice for or against the Rohrabacher amendment. I appreciate

what he is trying to do, but the fact the check is not in the mail is the reason why I introduced this amendment.

It is not cosmetic, and the intent of the amendment is to solve the unfunded mandate problem. We are going to come every time there is an unfunded mandate, and Members may want to vote for it or against it. They may want to make a speech for or against whatever bill. But if it does saddle our local governments and our States and others with costs, our Members will hear about it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman must understand that all the amendment says is that the Federal Government will cover these costs. There are countless programs that are now on the books, they sound really great, and all we say is, and, gee, local government, local school district, if you do not have enough money, do not worry, we will cover those costs. And it is not happening. The check is not in the mail, and merely saying that the Federal Government will pick up the costs will not make it happen.

My children believe in the Easter Bunny, but I, I say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] do not.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman continue to yield?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, we will hop down the Easter trail together opposed to unfunded mandates. The point I am trying to make is the gentleman from California will soon try to ask consent to change the amendment, saying if there is no money, then of course there is no requirement.

□ 1510

We are on the same side. It was just that the gentlewoman tried to change my intent.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman must know that there is no money. It is not if there is no money or if there is no Easter Bunny. There is no money, and there is no Easter Bunny.

Mr. ROBERTS. Then vote against the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] and quit picking on me.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I plan on voting against it. I do not think your amendment is going to satisfy the concerns, if they truly are serious concerns about unfunded mandates. This does not cover it. Do not fool the people into thinking that it does.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like unanimous consent, if I could, to add language—

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. VALENTINE). The Chair hears an objection.

Would you like to hear what the proposition is, or do you just object, period?

Mr. SERRANO. I object, and in anticipation—

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The objection is heard.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, may I make my point on what I would have done had there not been an objection?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Well, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman may propound his request for the record.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman and Members, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] is an honorable amendment. His intentions were clearly to deal with the unfunded-mandate issue.

We did not want to get into the debate of my colleague from California. We clearly wanted to talk about unfunded mandates, and we have a consistent position on this, and that is that if the Federal Government requires local governments, States, and counties and school districts to do something that they think is a good idea, we are asking the Federal Government to reimburse them for those good ideas, because it costs them money.

This amendment from my colleague, the gentleman from California, by my colleague from California, will cost somebody some money. Make no mistake about it, it will cost somebody some money. Somebody will have to pay to calculate those numbers and take the time to take the surveys. There will be personnel costs and so on and so forth.

We clearly wanted to simply ask that if you are going to mandate this on schools, please, reimburse them for the costs. We did not take a position on the amendment. That was not our intent. Our intent was to say it is unfunded mandate, and, please, recognize that and pay for it.

What I wanted to do to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] was just add language that the requirement of this title shall, however, be suspended if such reimbursement is not authorized by Congress. That is real clear, real clear. If you do not give them money for this mandate, then it is voluntary.

In my opinion, that is the way mandates here ought to be. It ought to be simply if you believe in something enough around here and it costs money, you ought to believe in it enough that you are willing to pay for it, and this is what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] was trying to do with his amendment.

It is an honorable amendment, and his intentions were right. I am sorry that we were not able to add this language that we think would have improved his amendment.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONDIT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Let the American people who are watching this debate fully understand exactly what maneuvers are going on here. An attempt is being made to authorize money.

The cochairman of the Unfunded Mandates Caucus, and I am a founding member of the Unfunded Mandates Caucus, are doing everything that they can to find language that will in some way be acceptable to people who are claiming that this is an unfunded mandate. That was the purpose of the original Roberts language.

Now we have an amendment to that trying to bend over backward to find the language in which the whole argument that this is an unfunded mandate can actually be addressed. Instead, what we have are the people who are using that argument against us to try to defeat this bill are defeating the attempt to make it or to address the problem, and the reason why this is happening is because they do not want the Federal Government to address the issue.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONDIT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman pointed over here and said that people are making the unfunded argument, but you have not heard that from the committee. No one on the committee has said anything about that. No one on the committee has made an argument against this amendment because of who is going to pay for it or not. We do not believe it is right to have little children in public schools enlisted to be spies against other members of their families, no matter who pays for it. We do not care whether it is funded or unfunded. It is immoral. It is wrong.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I am glad the gentleman made that point. He does not care either way whether it is funded or unfunded.

Mr. CONDIT. Reclaiming my time, I will simply say there have been a number of Members in this House on both sides of the aisle that have approached members of the Unfunded Mandates Caucus and pointed out that this is an unfunded mandate. We tried real hard to accommodate them. We tried to come up with language that was fair, and I want to commend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] for his honorable efforts to try to do that.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I wanted to first of all comment on the good intentions of the Unfunded Mandates Caucus. I understand, in our discussion, what they are trying to do to not place a burden on local school systems.

However, I have a concern that if we were to vote and accept that particular

amendment which says that there is no mandate, that we do not have to go along with this recording program, that, therefore, the program does not exist. This makes it more palatable perhaps in the minds of some people, and I, quite frankly, think that we should just vote down the Rohrabacher amendment on its own lack of merits and not because it is not something that is funded.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we, in Congress, must be committed to the education of all of our children. For this reason, I rise in opposition to the Rohrabacher amendment, which would require the more than 14,000 school districts across the country to report the number of undocumented students in their school systems. This amendment also would prohibit funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to serve students who are not lawfully in the United States. The Rohrabacher provisions are unwise, unworkable, and unfair for a number of reasons.

Keeping track of undocumented students would create a paper nightmare for school districts. The public schools in our country are not equipped to handle the enormous burden of gathering data regarding which students are not lawfully in the United States. The Rohrabacher amendment would turn local school districts into mini-immigration services, and every teacher, school principal, and school administrator would be an agent of the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS]. These school officials would have to determine the citizenship status of every student and their parents.

If the purpose of the Rohrabacher amendment is to address the problem of illegal immigration, there is no evidence that links illegal immigration to the right of public schooling. The Rohrabacher amendment simply would not work. Moreover, further inspection of the amendment raises concerns that, besides denying Federal funds for services to undocumented children, the provisions also would deny federally funded services to children who are in the United States legally.

Most immigrants, whether or not they are documented, most likely will remain in the United States. The Rohrabacher amendment would create a subclass of uneducated individuals who most likely would end up on the streets. Instead of contributing to the tax base of our society, these children would only add to the long-term problems of homelessness and crime.

The Rohrabacher amendment is punitive, mean-spirited, and unconstitutional. Why should we punish children for the actions of their parents? Our students represent the future of our Nation. We must educate all of our children, for they are the citizens of tomorrow and our future workers. In 1982, the Supreme Court handed down a

decision that all undocumented children have a right to a public education in the case, *Plyler* versus *Doe*. The Rohrabacher amendment clearly contradicts this Supreme Court decision which affirms that basic education cannot be denied to any child.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize and uphold the right of the United States to protect its borders and regulate immigration. The Rohrabacher amendment would do nothing to address concerns regarding illegal immigration. Instead, it would have a detrimental effect on children, and ultimately on the future of our Nation. I urge my colleagues not to allow immigration concerns to permeate education by voting against the Rohrabacher amendment.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Roberts amendment.

We should begin paying for these things. That is what the debate on the balanced budget amendment was, and this is going to be one of those small items that we are asking local governments to fulfill that ought to be paid for.

Now, should we ask schools to ask their students, "Are you a citizen?" There is tremendous cost involved here.

Second question: "Are either of your parents a U.S. citizen?" Tremendous expense here. People come here to have their babies, it is charged. We give free hospitalization, we print in Medicare—Medical, in California—in several languages, "We won't turn you in. We will give you free service if you want to have your baby here. We will pay for it." Where would you, if you lived in Latin America, want to have your child? Free delivery, free health care, free schooling on the U.S. taxpayer.

Folks, enough is enough. It is time we not only pay for the government we are having today, it is time to say we limit that service to the U.S. citizens and to those aliens who have waited patiently for 5 years to become citizens of the United States.

Instead, we say to anybody that can hobble, crawl, or swim or get over the border, "We will open up the treasury for you." And then we go home and talk how conservative we are and how we are going to balance the budget.

Who are we fooling?

Free education. UNESCO just said we spend more on education than any other country in the world. That was printed in *USA Today*.

Where would you go to have your child if you knew those facts? Right here. And they are doing it by the tens of thousands.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to say: In 1992 we spent \$13.2 billion, that is 13,200 million dollars, on primary and secondary education for illegal aliens; \$8.5 billion in Medicaid; \$7.8 billion for local health and welfare services; \$2.9 billion for bilingual education; and \$2.8 billion for AFDC, and over the next 10 years it is going to cost at least another 225,000 million dollars—that is \$225 billion.

Now, the majority leader said on this floor a little bit ago if we are going to deal with the illegal aliens problem, we ought to appropriate more money for the Immigration Service. And I agree with that. But that alone will not solve the problem. We need a full court press.

From Mexico alone we are getting a new 1.3 million illegal aliens staying in this country every single year. That is just Mexico. That is not coming across the Canadian border or through Miami or anyplace else. We have a virtual tidal wave of illegal aliens. We need a full court press through the health agencies, education agencies, and everything else to deal with this problem; otherwise we are going to be drowning in a sea of red ink caused, in large part, by illegal aliens coming into this country.

Mr. ROHRBACHER's amendment may not be the panacea for the problem, but it is a step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Chairman, two last points on my time. We are asking, through this act, 900 pages of regulations on the local school district. We say, "If you ask them if they are citizens," that is going to overburden the school districts. We have nationalized, in this act, the school system with Goals 2000.

Twenty percent of our prison population in California is illegal aliens. We say America is for opportunity; some come here for crime, free medical care, free education. Let us draw the line, let us accept the Rohrabacher amendment now.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. VALENTINE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first let me say that I am very proud of Chairman FORD, the gentleman from Michigan, and the Representative from Florida; the opposition to this legislation, along with the Representative from Maryland, is bipartisan, and it is heartening to see that the House of Representatives is reacting negatively to an assault that seems to be taking place not just on undocumented workers but on legal immigrants and later, next week, on eliminating bilingual education programs that benefit Hispanic children,

Asian children, and native American children.

While the debate on the restriction is an unfunded mandate debate, I want to speak here briefly on behalf of people who are part of the American dream. What I am pleased with is that it is not just members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, all of whom are opposed to the Rohrabacher amendment on a bipartisan basis, but it is Americans who, for whatever their ethnicity or ancestry, are strongly opposed to what is happening here.

Forget the fact that this amendment turns every educator in this country into an INS agent. Schools would have to determine the citizenship status of every student and every parent. Talk about paperwork on teachers, on administrators. First of all, this does not sound like a Republican amendment: more paperwork, more cost, unfunded mandates; with all due respect, the rhetoric we have heard over the years.

Our schools are overburdened with costs and redtape. We would be adding another layer.

This amendment would also cause discrimination against all nonwhite students and their parents. Why? Do you know why? Do you know who would be asked to produce their little card or would be asked to register and come to the principal's office? It is not going to be the American who looks like Robert Redford or Mr. ROHRBACHER; it is going to be the Hispanic, it is going to be the Asian, it is going to be the native American, the doesn't-look-quite-like-an-American. That is not right to do that to students and to parents.

Families are going to be wrongly identified, and irreparable damage is going to be done to American citizens and other people who are legally entitled to be in this country, not to mention the fact that you are going to make thousands of kids and parents feel not like Americans. They, their families, may have served in every war, they may have given blood for this country; but somehow because they do not look American, they're going to be unfairly singled out.

This is not the proper context to discuss this issue. Let us have a national immigration bill, a new one which deals with the issues of undocumented workers, of legal immigrants, that deals with the issue of the earthquake. But as immigrants, that deals with the issue of the earthquake. But as somebody of Hispanic ancestry, I cannot help but see that every bill—and now I understand that in the budget resolution there is another amendment that singles out a group of people. We know who it is, we know who you are talking about. That is not what America is all about.

So, I say let us start today with a rejection of the Rohrabacher amendment. Let us go next week also and say

"no" to two amendments that deal with bilingual education. In other words, they eliminate bilingual education, which, in districts all around this country, affect not just Hispanics, not just native American children, but affect children who are perhaps not that typical American.

So, once again to my colleagues, reach down and do the right thing. And the right thing is, yes, to cast a vote against unfunded mandates, which this bill does; yes, vote against more paperwork and more bureaucracy, which this amendment does; but also in terms of the humanity of this House, so that every American who is legally here—a nation of immigrants—can feel that they are not unfairly treated. This is what this amendment will do, and I ask for a "no" vote on the Rohrabacher amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the Rohrabacher amendment. This amendment, not only discriminates against innocent children, but it also adds an overwhelming burden on our own local schools which will effect the education of all children nationwide. The amendment is an unfunded Federal mandate which requires local schools to report on the immigration status of innocent children and their parents without giving any money to help schools with the enormous costs of conducting these investigations.

Under this amendment, school administrators and teachers who are already overwhelmed with the educational system would have to enforce complex immigration laws. Those in favor of the amendment may try to argue that its passage will prevent illegal immigration. Mr. Chairman, that is simply untrue. Instead, if this amendment passes, teachers will be overwhelmed with administrative burdens and costs and will be unable to give their full attention to educating our children. The result will be poorly educated individuals unable to contribute to the future work force of our country.

The Rohrabacher amendment would also expose innocent individuals who are U.S. citizens or otherwise legally admitted into this country to widespread discrimination. By requiring untrained State and local officials to make complex determinations on immigration status, it is likely that only those who appear foreign will be asked to produce proof of citizenship when they are detained or questioned. In fact, innocent individuals have been mistakenly deported, and under this amendment, cases of mistaken identity will be enormously increased. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will force teachers to single out and discriminate against students in order to receive the funds they desperately need. Such an idea is unthinkable and unfair to every child in this country.

This amendment also undercuts the Supreme Court decision mandating that States provide a public education to all children by potentially discouraging children from attending school. Without a good education, these individuals will be unable to contribute to the progress of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, school boards as well as the immigration and naturalization service oppose

this amendment. They do so because they understand that our focus needs to be on the enhancement of our educational system for all children. By discriminating against our children and by adding more burdens and costs to our local schools, we would be harming all Americans. The education of innocent children is at stake, and education is essential for all children in order to keep our Nation strong. I therefore urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Rohrabacher amendment.

OPPONENTS OF THE ROHRABACHER AND ROTH AMENDMENTS

Department of Education.
Immigration and Naturalization Service.
Office of Management and Budget.
Asian Law Caucus.
ASPIRA Association, Inc.
American Association of School Administrators.
American Federation of Teachers.
Asian-Pacific American Labor Alliance.
AFL-CIO.
Chinese for Affirmative Action.
Council of Chief State School Officers.
Council of Great City Schools.
California School Boards Association.
California State Department of Education.
Cuban-American National Council.
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities.
International Reading Association.
Japanese American Citizens League.
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund.
Multicultural Education, Training and Advocacy.
National Association for Bilingual Education.
National Association of Elementary School Principals.
National Association of Federally Impacted Schools.
National Association of State Boards of Education.
National Conference of State Legislatures.
National Education Association.
National HEP-CAMP Association.
National Hispanic Leadership Agenda.
National School Boards Association.
National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations.
National Council of La Raza.
National Council of Social Studies.
National Council of Teachers of English.
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
National Parent Teacher Association.
National Puerto Rican Coalition.
The Navajo Nation.
Organization of Chinese Americans.
Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Educational Fund.
State of New York.
Texas Education Agency.
U.S. Catholic Conference.
U.S. Conference of Mayors.

[From the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, Mar. 1, 1994]

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY H.R. 6—IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS ACT OF 1993

The Administration supports House passage of H.R. 6. The bill would: (1) reauthorize and restructure the elementary and secondary education programs of the Department of Education to make them better vehicles for helping all children achieve high standards; (2) direct greater Federal resources to the poorest schools and communities; (3)

support education reforms under way in the States; (4) support sustained intensive professional development in the core academic subjects for educators; (5) assist efforts to make our schools safe and drug-free; and (6) provide increased State and local administrative flexibility, in return for greater accountability for successful education results.

Although H.R. 6 contains provisions that the Administration does not support, it is consistent with Administration objectives and, in most respects, would substantially improve current law. The Administration looks forward to working with Congress to strengthen the bill further as it moves through the legislative process.

Of the amendments that may be offered on the House floor, the Administration strongly opposes the following:

(1) The Rohrabacher amendments that would affect undocumented students and children of undocumented parents. These amendments would impose an enormous data-gathering burden on schools and conflict with the Administration's goal of holding all children to the same challenging standards. States and local school systems would continue to have the constitutional responsibility to educate undocumented children, but public schools would be denied the Federal resources available to assist them in meeting their responsibility. Finally, these amendments would likely subject citizen and legal resident children of certain ethnic backgrounds to discrimination and humiliation.

(2) Any amendments that would restrict the ability of local communities to make their own decision about school-based health education and health services programs compatible with the needs of their children.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

Washington, DC, February 28, 1994.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to express the strong opposition of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) to the amendments to H.R. 6, the "Improving America's Schools Act of 1994," which have been proposed by Congressman Dana Rohrabacher. The first amendment would require local school districts to provide annually to the Department of Education the number of students who are not lawfully in the United States, and the number unlawfully here who do not have at least one parent or legal guardian who is lawfully in the United States. The second amendment would bar the use of Federal funds for assistance to any individual who was not a citizen or national of the United States, a permanent resident alien, or an alien who is a parolee, asylee or refugee.

As a practical matter, school districts cannot by themselves make immigration status determinations about students or their parents and therefore would have to work with INS to implement these amendments, which would be extremely difficult and enormously burdensome for the INS. INS would have to divert scarce resources from other enforcement priorities, including border enforcement and the removal of criminal aliens, to check both our automated and other records of aliens in the United States. The local educational authorities could not be directly linked to our automated databases without creating vast opportunity for privacy violations. Finally, the labor-intensive require-

ments contemplated by these amendments could not be assumed without extensive new resources.

In addition, the first amendment would require the local educational agency to count students who are not lawfully in the United States, which is a category that does not correlate with the one used in the second amendment to define alien students who could benefit from the Federal funds—"permanent resident aliens, parolees, asylees, and refugees." Certain other aliens are deemed by statute, regulation and court decision to be "lawfully in the United States."

I urge you and your colleagues to oppose this amendment. We share a concern that illegal aliens not be allowed to remain in the United States, but INS believes that these amendments will not further that end.

Thank you for your consideration of our views. The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

DORIS MEISSNER,
Commissioner.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, representing the districts I do, it would be very simple to get up and say I support the amendment. I do not support the amendment. I do not support the amendment for numerous reasons. But, No. 1, I do not support the amendment simply because I agree with what the majority leader says, which I will summarize in just one or two sentences. I think what the majority leader said was that he would hope that we would look at the issue, which certainly needs fixing. I do not think there is anyone in here who does not believe it needs fixing. But let us let the committees of jurisdiction act, and act promptly, so that we have a cohesive approach, rather than a piecemeal approach, which is what we will do if we keep adding pieces of other legislation that is before us.

I have a second concern. Every youngster that is born in this country is a citizen in this country. I have said over and over again that, if we are ever going to make the grade in dealing with illiteracy in the country and helping all people become productive citizens, there has to be a family effort to do that. So, Mr. Chairman, we cannot say on one hand that we support a family approach to the literacy problem and on the other hand say, "Well, the child was born here, so you can deal with him, but you can't deal with the parent." It would be my hope that we do have this comprehensive approach that will come later.

I do have to just jab a little at the Californians however. We lost two seats in Pennsylvania. We did not lose two seats in Pennsylvania because we lost population in Pennsylvania. We lost two seats in Pennsylvania because we did not have any illegal aliens to count, and we are allowed to do that

when we are talking about redistricting. So, I have to jab just a little at the Californians who are up here crying.

But again we need a comprehensive approach. That should come from the committees of jurisdiction. The youngsters that are here should be educated, and we should, in turn, make sure that their parents can become their first and most important teacher.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering an amendment offered by my colleague, Congressman ROHRBACHER, that would require school districts receiving funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to survey and report to the Department of Education the number of children in their schools who are undocumented residents or are the children of undocumented residents. Many Members have observed that this amendment is an unfunded Federal mandate because it would impose requirements on local school districts without providing them the funds necessary to implement the mandate. My colleagues who have labeled the amendment as an unfunded Federal mandate are correct. The Rohrabacher amendment, as drafted, would require local school districts to use their own resources in order to meet its requirements. Thus, it is an unfunded mandate.

As the cochair of the congressional caucus on unfunded mandates and as the primary sponsor of legislation addressing unfunded mandates, I am adamantly opposed to enacting further unfunded mandates. I have taken it as a personal responsibility to amend bills or amendments that impose unfunded mandates so that our local jurisdictions will not be saddled with financing further Federal dictates. Therefore, I, along with Congressman ROBERTS, attempted to amend Mr. ROHRBACHER's amendment so that it would not result in an unfunded mandate. That was our sole purpose—to prevent another unfunded Federal mandate from being passed onto our local governments. It should be understood that by attempting to amend Mr. ROHRBACHER's amendment we were in no way endorsing his proposal. In fact, I believe that the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the wrong forum to address our Nation's immigration policy. I say that even though I believe that our immigration policy is failing and States, such as California, are being made to suffer because of our inadequate immigration policy.

The Roberts amendment to the Rohrabacher amendment was defeated by the House. So the Rohrabacher amendment remains an unfunded mandate. Because it imposes costs on local schools without Federal reimbursement and because I believe that H.R. 6 is the wrong vehicle in which to address the shortcomings of our immigration policy, I will be opposing the amendment offered by Mr. ROHRBACHER.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to state my strong opposition to this amendment. This amendment is a bad idea whose time should never come.

Have we come to a time in our history when we want our school children

spying on their mothers and fathers. Is it the role of our schools to teach our children to be spies and informants. Does this amendment foster trust—trust between parents and their children, trust between teachers and their students. I say the answer is "no."

Rather than nurturing an atmosphere of trust, the Rohrabacher amendment would breed an atmosphere of suspicion and division.

Do we really want our little boys and girls to become little CIA agents or, in this case, INS agents. This is not what our schools are for. Our schools are for teaching and for learning.

This amendment was conceived in darkness and born of intolerance and division. It should not be the law of the land. I say let us defeat it now.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. VALENTINE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] for 5 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. VALENTINE). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Chairman, pardon me, but do we go back and forth?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will say that the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER] has already spoken on this amendment.

Mr. BAKER of California. On the Roberts amendment, Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken on this, and there are two others waiting behind me, so we are not short of Republicans here.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. If it is satisfactory, the Chair will recognize the gentleman next.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I consider the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] to be my good friend. Now that is said on this floor probably more often than not, and maybe it is thought to be a rhetorical flourish, but in this instance I think the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] would agree that indeed we are friends and that I urged him today, again and again as a friend, because I know him as someone who has stood up for civil rights, as someone who has stood up for human rights and someone who values a single standard of conduct across this world where human rights are concerned, but I urged him to withdraw this amendment because it is not worthy of the person that I know as DANA ROHRBACHER.

This is not the time to start a contemporary Schindler's List, and that is what this amendment is. This says, "Is

your mother or father Jewish? Is your mother or father a Bohunk?"

Mr. Chairman, when I grew up in Buffalo, NY, I knew what that was:

"Are you a Dutchie?"

"Are they a Wop?"

"Are they a Dego?"

"Are they a Kike?"

"Are they a Spic?"

And, my colleagues, do not think that is not what people think it is, and do not think we are going to get away with it, and do not sit there and frown on the other side while saying, "Oh, no."

And do not think it does not shame me to stand here with the countenance that I have, elected from a district that is three-quarters different color than I am, knowing that my ancestors were Scottish and driven out of Scotland by people who enclosed their land and said they were sheep thieves. I ask, "starting down this trail of telling people that how they look, and where they come from, and who they are is going to determine whether they can learn, whether they can pick up a school book?"

Mr. Chairman, a child is to be treasured, and a child is innocent.

Now I have heard words on this floor about building walls 20 feet high and digging ditches 20 feet deep. Well, if that is what it takes for human beings or adults in this world to address their problems with one another, then I say, "Go to it, but do not take their children and cause them to be the foundation of this kind of sin against their innocence."

Mr. Chairman, I say, "Vote down this amendment, and vote down all similar amendments. If we cannot have a world such as I come from, where I have the honor to be able to hold up my hand, as virtually everybody else has had that opportunity, to say that we honor a man like Mr. NATCHER today for voting for 40 years, to say that we hold up and defend the Constitution of the United States, to come from a place that is multiracial, multicultural, multiethnic, and we believe in having a rainbow of people in the United States of America, and to say to them, 'I'm sorry your parents are not legal, you're not allowed in this school, you have to prove whether you have a chance to be here to pick up that book to learn?'"

Mr. Chairman, people were put in detention camps in this country less than half a century ago because they were Japanese-Americans, and they were Americans. They were already citizens, and they were put into detention camps because of who they were. I ask my colleagues, "Do you think that this kind of mentality is any less than that mentality?"

I thought we learned something. This Congress actually compensated those people for that wrong that was committed, and yet today we stand here and say we are going to do it.

I say to my colleague, DANA, my friend, please withdraw this amendment. If you want to bring up the other, we can debate it about whether to mandate it or not mandate it. If you want to talk about bilingual education, we can discuss that. That's a matter of policy. That's a matter of philosophy. But this is a fundamental matter of humanity. DANA, please withdraw this amendment.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I know this is boring, but I would like to get back to the amendment.

This bill says that H.R. 6 funds cannot be used by any agency unless they report the number of students enrolled who are not lawfully in the United States. Has nothing to do with bilingual education. Has nothing to do with anything we have just heard. It has to do with how many people are being subsidized by the U.S. taxpayers who are not here legally.

I tried to make this point when we created the new National Standards Act and we had 4 hours of debate just like this. It was emotional, heart-wrenching, but not to the point.

The taxpayers are fed up because we will not balance our budget, they are fed up because we are living and rolling in debt, and they are fed up because more and more people are coming here illegally. We already accept more people legally each year than the rest of the world combined, and now we say, "Come have your child. We'll pay for the delivery. We'll pay the medical costs. We won't turn you in to INS."

I ask, "What if you're an employer? What has this same Congress said? What have the people that have been making these heart-wrenching speeches said to the employers who feed these families?"

"If you don't ask, if you don't fill out your forms correctly, we will fine you \$5,000, and if you don't report every illegal alien, we will put you out of business."

□ 1540

That is what we tell employers. What do we tell government agents? It is discriminatory if they ask if they are here legally. That is a burden in costs. It is going to destroy public education. It is going to punish children. Yet we flog employers in the United States if they do not ask.

Where do the INS agents go? Do they patrol the border? They try. They go to the farms, they go to the restaurants, they go out and find the people who are productive. Do they go to the welfare offices? Do they go to the unemployment offices? Do they go to the schools? No. They flog those people who come here for opportunity.

If we want to balance this budget, we should send the INS agents to the pris-

ons and take all the 20 percent of California, 16,000 strong, and return them to sender.

Let us not be emotional. Let us read the amendment. No school district receives funds unless they report the number of students enrolled who are not lawfully in the United States.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for us to describe to the people who are watching and listening to this debate exactly what has happened in the debate so far.

There was an attempt to authorize the funds, which I would say would be a minimal cost, of just asking those two questions about whether someone was here legally or was a U.S. citizen, and that was voted down by Members who are now opposed to those claiming it is an unfunded mandate. We have a quote from Chairman FORD, who suggested he does not care if it is funded or not, he would be opposed to it whether or not it was funded.

So if the public is listening or if the public who are reading the transcript will understand, that is where it is really at. This whole argument about whether it is funded or not funded is kind of a vehicle to oppose the substance of the amendment. The substance we are talking about is an attempt to get control of a flood of illegal aliens who are coming into our country and basically taking resources that they, as illegal aliens from whatever country they come from, should not be entitled to because we do not have enough money to provide medical care and education and housing benefits and all the other benefits for everyone in the world who can get here illegally.

I have been in favor of legal immigration. I voted for the last immigration bill, which was a very substantial and positive bill, and I am in favor of legal immigration. But if we just say that anyone who comes here illegally can get the same benefits package and is indeed entitled to the same benefits package as Americans, we are condemning our own people, our seniors, and our younger people, to basically a breakdown in the social services and a breakdown in their educational system.

I know that people are trying to say that those of us on this side are in some way mean spirited, or at least they imply it. We do not have to be mean-spirited to say that we cannot take care of everybody in the world and we have a limited pot to draw from. But that money should be spent for people who are here legally and who are U.S. citizens. That is not mean spirited. I think that is a caring attitude, because if the system breaks down, nobody is going to be helped.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take all of my time. For once it is good to be a member of the committee and be able to be recognized ahead of others who are waiting in line.

Let me talk about something a little bit away from the amendment itself, and then I will come back to it in very succinct words.

The majority leader stood up and said he would work in the direction that we need to stop illegal immigration with an immigration bill, and I would ask my colleagues to support that because I think that is the direction all of us want to go instead of attacking each and every one of the bills that come up with different items. The reason is that if we can stop and have the means of stopping illegal immigration into our country from whatever direction, then we would not have two-thirds of our children in Los Angeles who are born to illegals going down and collecting AFDC. There will still be some, but that number will dwindle. And we will not have these same problems with the States not being funded to provide the schools, because those students will not end up in the schools because they are illegal and they are stopped at the border. I think that is the general direction my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would like to go. I think that is what they would like to support. I do not think it is healthy for us to fight on every one of these bills, although I understand the desire to fight on this issue.

Let us take a look at what we can do to stop the illegal immigration in our country. One of the problems we have, especially in the State of California is that a school district that does not get its Federal money does not really cry at not getting the money from the Federal Government for illegal immigrants. They get it from the State. The Federal Government covers only about 5 percent of the total education dollars, a very small portion. So the school district goes to the State budget and says, "We have these many faces sitting in chairs, and we need the money," and they get the money for those students. There is no problem there.

Where the problem exists is when they go back to the Governor or the budget committee at the State level and hey ask for dollars for their normal programs and the Governor says, "Sorry, we have no more money. We will have to cut your education programs. It is not fair because we haven't divvied up with the Federal dollars."

I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER]. We need to identify the numbers. I question whether this is the right area to do it. I think if we can get an immigration bill and if our colleagues will support our getting an im-

migration bill on the floor out of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has been a black hole for this subject for a long time, then I think both sides of the aisle can come to some agreement, and maybe we can stop the rhetoric on both sides.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], for the benefit of our fellow Members, which State is the gentleman from?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. California.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. And Mr. ROHRBACHER?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. California.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. The State of California. I guess most of the proponents of this measure are from the State of California?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think primarily the border States of Texas, Arizona, California, and any other States that have been affected.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman did an excellent job of explaining to the taxpaying citizens the responsibilities of running a school system and it is pretty much the same throughout our country. The locals pay for the buildings and the administration, and the States pay for the classroom teachers. What this bill does is put a burden on little towns like Kiln, MS, Bay St. Louis, MS, and Biloxi, MS, that do not have immigration problems, requiring them to fill out more forms. They do not have immigration problems. In fact, let us face it, out of 50 States, how many States really have immigration problems? It is mainly California.

If California has a problem, would not that problem be best addressed in the California Legislature rather than the U.S. Congress? I do not solve all of Mississippi's problems here in Congress. They have a wonderful legislature that takes care of Mississippi's problems.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me say that I understand what the gentleman is saying. One of the problems is that the taxpayers in California then have to foot the bill for the other States for the education portion, because it is costing us \$3.7 billion a year that we do not have. And it is a national problem. The gentleman from Mississippi said we do not have individual problems, but we do have a problem, and all we are asking is that when it comes time to come on the floor with a bill out of the Committee on the Judiciary on illegal aliens and legal aliens, the gentlemen support us on the House floor. I think in answer to the gentleman's question, speaking to Members on both sides of the aisle, that it would be much better for all concerned if we would focus on that area.

□ 1550

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, during the last few months, we have come to the floor to discuss this issue in a different form almost on a weekly basis, and during that time and each one of those times, the debate has been very emotional, as in fact it has been today. And I have been part of that very emotional debate.

Today I decided I was going to try something new, that I was going to come to the floor and only discuss the numbers and only discuss the issue, and try to stay away from the emotion of this issue, only to realize that I was fooling myself, that indeed this is not a debate about numbers, it is a debate about a cheap political style. And that is to take the suffering of a people and to use it for those people to feel that we in Congress are helping them by turning them against another group of suffering people.

So it is true, as it has been said on this floor, that the American people are complaining about how many dollars they pay in taxes. And it is true, also, as has been said on this floor, that the American people are complaining in many cases about their condition.

What is not true, however, and we have to be clear on it, is that the American people were the ones who thought up this idea of turning on permanent residents, on illegal immigrants, and the children who may be here undocumented. That is not true, and the record should show it is not true. It wasn't the people that started discussing that subject. It was talk show hosts and some elected officials in this country who decided that it was easier to come up with an easy target, rather than to sit down and really try to solve the problem of the economy, of housing, of jobs, of social services.

So now we stand up here and we say that if we really turn on these little children, and we make them spy on their parents, and we try to document every one who is not documented as an undocumented person, that somehow we will be servicing the American people. We are mistaken.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] has said that some people have implied that this amendment is mean spirited. I want to be clear in this, one of my two languages. I am not implying. I am stating that it is mean spirited, it is misguided, it is foolish, and it divides our community.

Now, a lot of the people that got up to speak also have no understanding of what a school district goes by. Well, in my other life, before the State legislature and before the Congress, I was a district school administrator. And we had at that time 33,000 students from all over the United States and, for that matter, from all over the world.

What I would have to do today under this amendment, to go and ask every single child to bring proof—to bring proof—that he and his parents are documented, is beyond anything that anyone can imagine here. It would be a burden that I could not carry.

There is the additional problem which I continue to bring up, and I will continue to bring it up all the time, which seems to score no points with very few people who propose these amendments, and it is the fact that there are people in this country who were born citizens, whose ancestors have been born citizens for hundreds of years, but who continue to look different from what Hollywood and other places think Americans should look like, and only they will be asked to produce papers.

Let us face it. A child with my name, looking somewhat un-American, quote—unquote, would be asked to produce papers. I have done it a hundred times and I will do it again.

You see, I carry no proof that I am an American citizen. I was born in Puerto Rico a citizen. I have no proof. Incidentally, if you come up with another amendment to make me carry papers, I will never carry papers to prove I am an American citizen.

Let us understand that this is not a good idea. Let us understand that this is not supported by people who work in the field.

I have and I will submit for the RECORD the names of 40 organizations who have written to you, people like the Department of Education, the INS, the Office of Management and Budget, the School Boards Association, the Elementary School Principals, the Federally Impacted Schools, the Bar Association, all throughout this Nation, saying you cannot do this. Please, let us defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana and by unanimous consent, Mr. SERRANO was allowed to proceed for an additional 30 seconds.)

Mr. SERRANO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. As a school administrator, I would like to ask the gentleman, in your school, did the students have to have it certified that they had their measles shots and other shots?

Mr. SERRANO. Unfortunately, when I was an administrator, we did not pass that law yet. They did not have to verify that.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is unusual. Most of the country does.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was not going to speak on this issue today, but I have been sitting and listening to a lot of

the debate, a lot of the rhetoric. I would like to respond to a couple of the comments that have been made and I think that we really need to focus on, which is something that we have not addressed today.

Americans come in all colors. So do illegal aliens. This is not an issue of color. It is not an issue of ethnic background. It is an issue of the law.

In California, and in other States, this is not a small problem, Mr. Chairman. We are not talking about a few hundred or a few thousand. We are talking about several hundred thousand individuals that are in our public schools that have no legal right to be in the United States. That is the issue. It is an issue of the law.

Mr. Chairman, when I was a student in elementary school, I remember that it was a requirement for me when I enrolled in school to present my birth certificate. Somewhere along the line these things have changed. I have raised four children in the public school system, and I can tell you that my children, and hopefully some day grandchildren, when they apply to school, I would have no problem at all if the administrators asked for my children's proof of residency, and I do not think that anybody that is intellectually honest on this would object either.

Mr. Chairman, the folks that are hurt the most by this issue of illegal immigration are those that can afford to be hurt the least, and we do have an obligation to those that have a lawful right to be in this country first.

Mr. Chairman, I would yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I would congratulate the gentleman for underscoring a point that needs to be made, and that is this is not an issue of race. This is an issue of economics and legality. I have had a great outpouring of support from Americans of Mexican descent in California who support this proposal and my basic fundamental position, which is that public services should not be provided for illegal aliens.

Mr. Chairman, they support this position because they themselves depend on many of these government services, and see that the quality of the services are being diluted as they are being stretched to the breaking point. We have to make a choice with limited resources between people who are here legally, whether they are citizens or legal residents, and people who are here illegally, because so many people have come here from other countries it is beginning to break down the public services in many of our urban areas, especially in California.

Mr. Chairman, those on the floor saying this is a matter of race, because it is so terrible they are going to be asked, and obviously they will only be

asking people who look like they are Mexican Americans, or Hispanic-American, will probably be the only ones asked, that is what is being implied, that is not the case at all.

This legislation would require people to present their birth certificate to prove legal status. Everybody. Every child.

By the way, those who are complaining the most about this, and I would hope to be corrected if I am wrong, are the ones who would absolutely mandate this on employers, and not think anything of requiring this horrible, horrible mandate on people, to do what they consider to be something racist. But the fact is, if it was so racist, they would not want to put this on the employers.

What we are doing now basically by the policies we are stating today, is we are making it a crime for an illegal alien to work, but we are giving an incentive for people to come here illegally and to consume government benefits, and many of the times those government benefits are being stretched to the breaking point, to the point our own people who paid for them, of every race and ethnic background, are getting shortchanged.

That is not what this Government is supposed to be about. It is not that we do not care about those people coming here. We have to care about our own people more, because that is the wonderful thing about America.

□ 1600

We come from everywhere. We are part of the great American family, but we cannot just dissipate all the funds on people who come here illegally. The Immigration Service cannot do it on their own.

We have Members saying, "Just let the Immigration Service do it." If we are providing benefits, who is kidding who here? The American people understand that if we are providing huge cash incentives and benefit packages to people who come here illegally, the Immigration Service is never going to be able to get control of the situation.

We are trying an honest, good-faith effort of good will to come to grips with the problem that affects the lives of our people. The people who are watching and reading this RECORD will understand who is thwarting what and who is trying to correct the problem.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would like to build a little bit on what the gentleman from New York said. In this country, I have noticed in the last 30 years we have to have someone to bash.

I remember at one time it was the truckers. If a person was a trucker, we had to bash them. We were popular, if we could be against the truckers.

Then it was the doctors, the doctors were the bad people in this country.

And for a couple of years that was the popular thing to do.

This seems to have started a year ago. I know there are a lot of illegal aliens. We do not know how many. We have tried to count them. I have been down there on the border. I have talked to a number of them that came across.

Some of them come across five times a year. They come over here for one purpose. It is to earn some money to go back home and feed their family.

We ought to be paying attention to the real problem here instead of bashing people all the time and trying to find some way to offset the deficiency in California's State laws.

If California has got deficiencies in their laws, correct them. But do not come down here to the Congress and try to hook something onto every bill.

Last year we had it on an appropriations bill, the one I handled. I opposed it. We defeated it. We finally defeated it.

This year it started right out, the first bill out of the box. Bash the aliens. We will have this all year. This is not the end. If we pass this, we will have it next year. It just whets the appetite.

Let us sit down and be reasonable, try to figure out what some of the problems are, relieve some of the pressures. There are pressures within Mexico. We know that. There are pressures down there. They come over here to get a job. That is what they come for, for no other reason.

We do not know how many there are, but let us try to relieve the problem by getting at the real problem and not bashing somebody on every bill that comes up this year. We are going to have 13 appropriations bills. We are going to have this 13 times, if we do not stop it.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am for dealing with the illegal alien problem. I have been for doing something about it since 1975, when I was vice chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and became deeply involved in this subject.

I regret to say, however, that I am opposed to this amendment. I think this amendment is wrongly drafted. I will get into that.

I do not think this is the way to go about solving the illegal alien problem. And my good friend and colleague [Mr. ROHRBACHER], and he is that, I appreciate the interest and the effort, because this is of concern, not only in California but throughout America. And it ought to be.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] mentioned that he is well aware of the advantages of illegal aliens in California, because Pennsylvania lost two seats. He is correct. I went around the House, when we secured the additional money for the Border Patrol, and told a number of my

colleagues that their State will again lose additional seats after the next national census in the year 2000.

We need your help or you will lose a lot more seats to California. And you should lose seats to California and the Southwest as well as the Southeast if you do not help us.

I regret that until recently, when President Clinton advocated the counterfeit-proof Social Security card, that is the first time I have seen a President of the United States want to do something about this problem. Since 1975 and in 1980, two of us on the Commission on Civil Rights raised the issue and sought Federal action in doing something about the problem.

What Congress did do has not worked.

I am angered that no President in either party has seen fit to do something about illegal aliens for almost two decades. I hope President Clinton sticks with the promise of a counterfeit-proof Social Security card. That would truly help to implement the Simpson-Mazoli act.

As a Californian and a native son, I can recall the 1930's and the 1940's rather well. I can recall the time the teacher went around the room and asked us in what country our parents were born. My father happened to be a legal German immigrant in 1903 and had long been an American citizen. Hitler was at his prime in the late 1930's. I knew that if I answered "Germany", I would have a little trouble on the playground. I was not completely stupid.

He was born in Bavaria, and so I answered "Bavaria." Nobody had ever heard of Bavaria.

I remember rather well early 1942, when one-third of my classmates disappeared from the fifth grade. The shame of America, the shame of California, when Japanese-Americans, most of them citizens of the United States, were forcibly removed from their California homes and put in relocation camps. I still remember the Christmas present that little Eddie Kamomoto had left for me in the fifth grade class exchange. He was not there to finish the year or to graduate from elementary school with his class in 1945—the year that the Second World War ended. I think we all agree that the discrimination against those citizens and legally admitted aliens was shameful. Reparations were made by preceding Congresses. Those monetary awards do not bring back the last years to a generation of children. The actions that were taken were clearly unconstitutional.

There are actions we could take that would be constitutional, and we should take them.

I can also recall 1949, when I was called into the office of the superintendent of the high school. And he said, "I am sorry. You can't win the statewide prize of this nonprofit asso-

ciation because you have to have both of your parents born in America."

My father, a German immigrant and an American citizen, had worked in the United States Patent Office on chemical patents in the First World War. He and other American citizens of German ancestry were hounded by many. Most Americans of German ancestry have heard those experiences, whether they occurred in Nebraska or in California or in Washington, DC.

Now, if the school district would mail the certification to the parents, I would not have a problem with that. But I will tell Members what the school district will do. It will give the form to little Susie and little Johnny or little whoever and ask the child to take home the certification form in order to save the postage out of the school budget. And it will be the talk of this or that child on the playground. Many of these children do not know that they are children of illegal alien parents.

I just do not think that is the way to go about it. If we should do something like this, let us provide the money. Let us make sure the school districts have to mail the forms. And let us also do what counts first, which is learn to control our borders.

We have not done it on the Canadian border. Nobody talks about that. We certainly have not done it on the southern border or on the east coast and the west coast, as we have seen the Chinese loaded ships headed in our direction.

We have a problem. Anybody that had a semialert brain knew we had a problem 20 years ago.

It is about time we quit burying this in committees and get to work on solving the problem.

I shall vote against this amendment. But I am sure for doing something about it. If the Congress does not act responsibly and has more procrastination, Members will find me at the head of the line supporting an amendment like this next time.

In the meantime, let us straighten it out and do it rationally and let us do it constitutionally.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague from California that we cannot solve all of our immigration problems by adding these types of amendments on the bills that come before us either in authorization or appropriation.

Earlier colleagues, as I got to the floor, talked about obeying the law. I wonder if they understand that the reason that we do not ask for birth certificates, and we have not since 1982, has been that the Supreme Court, in the decision of Plyer versus Doe, they said that all children have the right to a public education regardless of the status of their parents. So that is the law of the land today.

I think the Supreme Court, in their judgment, looked at that law for social reasons. They knew that throughout the years, in the past and in the future, we are going to have immigrants, legal and illegal, in this country. And rather than have an underclass of uneducated residents, that it was in good social policy that we educate them, because they will become, whether we like it or not, the work force of the future. We would want them to be competitive in this country.

So we are obeying the law, Mr. Chairman. We are obeying the law of 1982, as set down by the Supreme Court.

I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], that we are going to have to solve our immigration problem.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

There is only one person in this entire Congress that may be pure, and that is Senator CAMPBELL on the other side. No one else is really pure here.

□ 1610

You know, it is the vehicle, not the question of controlling our borders, it is the vehicle that is being proposed.

As a former school board member and the chief financial officer of a school district, it would be impossible to bring in all of the thousands of children in that district one by one, and say to little Jose, "Jose, are you a legal citizen of the United States?" Where do we start? Does it start with everybody? Imagine the cost, imagine the time.

In reality, when school administrators are forced to do this, does it start with, "Anybody who is a Smith is okay," but does my son Bobby at 8 years old, who happens to have the last name Menendez, does he get called in and say, "Bobby, are you a citizen? Are your parents citizens?" Or does his mother, who is Norwegian, Irish, and German, then is she a citizen? Where does it start and where does it end? Or is anyone who is black, is it believed that maybe they might be African, so therefore they are called in; or anyone who is Asian, it is believed that they are not American, so they are called in; or anyone who has a brogue, and in fact maybe they are an illegal person here from Ireland? Where does it begin and where does it end?

It seems to me that many of the names that appear on this board when we vote on this amendment, if this same issue had been here at a different time, we might not be speaking about Menendez and Torres and others, and Serranos, we would be speaking about many other different names, the very names of the proponents of this legislation, this amendment.

The fact of the matter is this is not how to spend our tax dollars on a witch hunt. It is not to ask children, "Your mother and father, are they U.S. Citizens?" We are going to make them experts in immigration, something I practiced law in when I used to practice law. It is simply ridiculous.

The tone and tenor of those who propose these amendments, the venom that you can hear, it just, to me, is not what America is all about. Yes, let us control our borders, but let us not use children against their parents in a Gestapo-like attitude as our police arm of this Congress. What a failure, that we would have to use children against their parents to accomplish this goal.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. VALENTINE). The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR] has expired. (By unanimous consent, Mr. PASTOR was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. PASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Nazis have invaded Denmark. It is World War II. They have taken the whole place over. The people are very concerned. They were looking for certain people and they could not really identify them. Some of them they could, some of them maybe did not look like they were Danes. It was kind of hard to identify some of the Jews, so the Nazis said, "This is the order. Tomorrow morning every Jew must wear a gold badge saying, 'Jude,' 'I am a Jew,' and if anybody knew one who was not wearing it, they were to be turned in.

When the sun rose over Copenhagen that next morning, we found a very Christian King walking the streets wearing one of those yellow labels, saying that he was a Jew. As people woke up realizing what had happened, they came out of their homes, not just the Jews but everybody in Denmark, wearing yellow badges, saying, "I am a Jew," so that the Nazis could not tell one from the other.

Let us, Mr. Chairman, not hang labels on each other. Let us not divide our society. Let us not turn each other in. Let us address the issues that we as a civilized people should be addressing here in the proper legislation. Do not make piranhas out of each of us. This is not the American way. It is not the human way. Please do not vote for this kind of absurdity in this great Nation of ours.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a very emotional debate. I am sorry for some of what has been said, because a few minutes ago, as I was watching the debate, I heard one of our colleagues come to the floor and utter some despicable racial slurs and names in de-

fense of his own policy. I think that that really does not help us here, and I do not think we ought to debate these kinds of things with the kind of hate and venom that I have heard from some people.

I have also noticed that one group that has not been mentioned very much in the course of the debate is the American middle class, who ends up, regardless of what we do, having to pay the bills, and is quite concerned about the direction in which their country is going, too. They have to pay the bills for whatever we decide to do in this regard, and they do so in many cases by working 40, 50, 60 hours a week, sometimes two members of the family working hard to eke out a living for themselves and their children, and hope a little bit about the future.

What they also are concerned about, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the law does not seem to mean much anymore. Most of them, whether they be black or white, whether they be Hispanic or oriental, regardless of race, creed, or color, work every day and do so in a way that obeys the law. One of the things they are most concerned about is the fact that somehow this Congress does not seem to recognize that that is a sacrifice on their part. There are lots of people around who like to evade the law, who like to find some way to explain away the law, because it gives them some comfort in order to do so.

The vast American middle class suggests that obeying the law is in fact a positive public good, and they think it is important for them to do. Even at a penalty to themselves and their families, they obey the law. They are very confused, then, when their government comes along and suggests that people who do not obey the law ought to be treated in special ways.

As I read the Rohrabacher amendment, the fundamental part of this amendment says obeying the law is a necessity. I do not understand why we would have such an emotional debate on the issue of whether or not the law should be obeyed. This Congress is sending some very bad signals. We sent some very bad signals yesterday when we voted on resolutions which suggested that our own rules were not important, that investigation of unethical conduct was not important. The American people and particularly the American middle class is sitting out there saying, "They expect me to obey the laws that they pass, and yet they say to others, 'Go ahead and break the law and we will look the other way.'"

I am real concerned about that and I think Americans are concerned. If we wonder why there is disrespect for that which we do, it is because they think we disrespect the law. In my view, if we do not approve something, and I do not know whether this is the most artfully drafted language, but we ought to approve something that suggests that the

law is important, and that people who do not obey the law will in fact be punished in our society.

I am hopeful that as we go about debating this issue further, that we will not suggest that somehow the law is something that we can put aside without any consideration at all.

□ 1620

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Rohrabacher amendment. And, frankly, I agree with one statement by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], who preceded me. The law must be obeyed, and the law, as the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR] pointed out, says that all children in America have a right to be educated without regard to the status of their parents.

I rise in opposition to this amendment for three reasons as a parent and as a legislator. First of all, the provisions would impose an unaffordable cost on the school systems in our country, and I do not think any parents in America want that.

Second of all, it would have a chilling effect on the education of many undocumented children, all of whom have the right to be educated in our country, as the law indicates, as the gentleman from Arizona pointed out. Children denied an education are not likely to grow up as productive members of our society.

The Rohrabacher amendment would have a negative and costly impact on our entire society. I do not think the parents of this country who want the best for their children want their children in a society where other children are deprived of an education.

Third, I believe that this amendment would serve no legitimate immigration policy purpose. Determining citizenship status of schoolchildren and their parents will not deter undocumented immigrants from entering the country. Indeed, it would impose a burden on teachers and administrators and children to check up on the legal status of parents, and that is a waste of energy and counterproductive to the goal of decreasing the number of illegal immigrants in this country.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe that this particular provision has no place in the laws which guide and authorize funding for the education of our children. I urge my colleagues to join in casting a no vote against the Rohrabacher amendment.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I want to assert my very strong opposition to the Rohrabacher amend-

ment. There have been some very eloquent statements made here today citing the history of this country and the responsibilities that we have as a nation for the children who live here, not to establish punitive measures against them or to place onerous obligations and burdens upon the school systems.

We have been importuned this afternoon to obey the law, and I think each and every one of us stands before this body with a commitment, a sworn commitment to abide by the law. It is this amendment that is an infraction upon what has already been established not only as the philosophy, as the policy, but as the law of this land, and that is we must not discriminate in the education of our children. There have been Supreme Court decisions, lower court decisions. This has been the established policy of this country.

In looking at this amendment one would have to ask what is the purpose of it? The purpose is to try to invoke the other laws that are in effect with reference to immigration and to make it part of the policy of our public school system. This is to impose a new duty upon our schools that have no part whatsoever in the educational improvement or enhancement of the quality of education in our school systems. And, in fact, it is an abrogation of the Supreme Court decisions which say we must educate all of our children.

So without the purpose of this amendment to enhance public education but to force our schools and our teachers and our families to police ourselves in the school systems, I believe it is not only a tragic abrogation of what the policy of this country has been over the years, but should be absolutely turned down by this body.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have been told here this afternoon by our friend, for example, from New Jersey that we are all a nation of immigrants, and of course no one would deny that, because we all are a nation of immigrants. But that is not the issue here. The issue here is one of illegal versus legal.

Yes, no one likes to be pointed out as a group, and I think no one wants to do that. The United States is a nation of individuals, not a nation of groups. And it seems to me we got into this hassle in this country when we began looking at ourselves, as groups rather than as individuals. And, as Woodrow Wilson said, as long as you consider yourself a part of a group rather than a individual, you are not really assimilating into American society.

We have heard a lot of red herrings today, a lot of issues very emotional that have nothing to do with this particular amendment as I see it. You know, if we give additional dollars to illegal aliens, are we not taking money away from the people who are the citizens of this country? And where does

our first obligation lie? With the citizens of this country. I think so. And that is why I think that this particular amendment makes a lot of sense.

We do have problems with illegal aliens. OK. If you do not like the solution, what are your solutions, how would you address the issue? Just to come to the floor here and make a lot of emotional statements is not going to resolve the issue, is not going to get at the problem. What are your solutions?

This Nation of America has been good to all of us. We are all Americans in this Chamber. This Nation has been good to you; this Nation has been good to me. We have an obligation to this country, you and I, and if we have a problem with illegal aliens, then by golly we have to ask ourselves how are we going to address this problem. And just a lot of hot, emotional rhetoric is not going to solve this problem.

I have heard a lot of rhetoric here on the floor this afternoon, but I have not heard any solutions. The only solution we have so far is the Rohrabacher solution. So if you have a better solution, let us hear it. But just to get up and make a lot of emotional statements is not going to get the issue resolved.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Before I proceed in my opposition to the Rohrabacher amendment, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding. I am sorry I was not here earlier. We are working on the crime bill which everybody is looking forward to anxiously I am sure. Week after next, folks.

Mr. Chairman, I have examined this and members of my subcommittee have examined the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], and it just invites racial discrimination. It is almost frightening what would happen to the children and the parents of the children if this became law.

My colleagues, we cannot turn schoolteachers into Border Patrol agents and have these children harassed by standing up and saying, "What are you? What are you?"

And of course, the cost of all of these statistics is going to be enormous, and especially in my State of California where unfortunately so many of the undocumented persons end up.

Also, these schools are stuck, happily, with a Supreme Court decision which says that they have to be educated no matter who they are, that they are entitled by law to an education.

So Mr. Chairman, I urge a resounding no vote, and again thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. KOPETSKI. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his comments. I think it is important for Members to look at some of the legal liability issues involved in the Rohrabacher amendment.

Clearly what it says is that school districts are in danger and could lose all of their Federal funding if they adopt as a policy or de facto not enforce the policy enunciated in the Rohrabacher amendment.

Second, they do face losing all of their Federal funds if either a teacher or the district fails to follow up on an accusation made by either a student or a parent that a child in the district is here illegally in this country.

Finally, I think the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary's subcommittee alluded to this, but it is a question of how quickly will the ACLU or some other group bring a lawsuit against a school district or a teacher where there is a false accusation of a child being illegally in this country or where they are illegally here and dismissed from the school for that reason. This just invites very expensive lawsuits against the school district, and I think it is important just to get to the basic policy. We are not saying here that the respect for law is not important. We are saying here the issue before us is who is to enforce the law.

□ 1630

We have the INS; we have local sheriffs that deal with this. That is where the solution lies. It is not with the children of America.

It is not unfair, inaccurate, or just rhetoric to say that this is modeling the practices of Germany in the 1930's. We are not saying this just for scare tactics. It is a historical comparison as fact and as a comparison that is necessary to be made.

And so I ask my distinguished friends on both sides of the aisle to think through this amendment. We do not want our children to grow up in an atmosphere where they are expected in a learning environment especially to act as police officers. They are not trained, they are not mature enough. And it is not their job in the school building to be acting as police officers. Their job there is to learn to socialize, to learn how to think for themselves, to learn the respect for law in this society, and that is why we must resoundingly defeat the Rohrabacher amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a piece of information that is given out by the Medi-Cal organization. It is the Medicaid of California. It says, "Medi-Cal has good news for pregnant women." This is printed in both Spanish and English, and passed out down along the Mexican-American border in this form. I want to read to my col-

leagues what it says: "Even if you applied for amnesty or are in this country illegally, you can now receive a special kind of Medi-Cal or Medicaid for your health care purposes." It says, "If I am here illegally, will it be reported to Immigration?" And the answer is, "No. Under the new law, Medi-Cal cannot report you to Immigration for applying for or receiving Medi-Cal while you are pregnant."

Federal taxpayers' dollars are being encouraged to be used for the delivery of children by pregnant women in California.

Now, we brought this issue to the floor of the House before, and no action was taken. This body took no action on dealing with the advertising, the advertising of bringing Mexican-Americans across the border to have their babies, and it even goes so far as to say, "We will not report you to Immigration if you applied for these benefits."

Now, today we have got this education bill that deals with reporting whether or not a child is here illegally or legally. Every single time we try to close the loophole that allows illegal aliens into this country, we receive the same argument from the liberals in this body, "Oh, my gosh, that is not humanitarian, it is Nazistic," it is whatever.

My question is: "Who speaks for the American taxpayer? Who speaks for the people who are paying these bills?" As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] said a few moments ago, who speaks for the middle class in this country, the American taxpayer who is paying for all of this? Every single time a measure is brought to this body to deal with the illegal immigration problem, some spurious argument is raised, and it is dealt with in the wrong way. We kill it; no positive things are being done to deal with the illegal immigration problem, and as a result, from Mexico alone, we are getting 1.3 million illegal aliens staying in this country every single year. That does not include those coming from Canada or the east coast or the west coast or through Miami and the Caribbean.

Mr. Chairman, we are being inundated with these people, and every single thing that comes up like the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] goes right down the toilet, because we do not want to deal with it.

The American taxpayer sits at home and watches us on television and says, "Why in the world are they wasting our taxpayer dollars? Why are we not dealing with this problem?"

I say that if you do not like the Rohrabacher amendment, then come up with something else. We have got to deal with this. There is a virtual tidal wave of illegal aliens coming into this country that the taxpayers are paying for, and we are not doing a darn thing about it.

Now, go home and ask your constituents. Do not listen to me. Ask your constituents what they think about it. They are going to tell you they do not want this thing going on. They do not want their taxpayers' dollars being wasted for this, and they do not want that deficit to increase, because they know down the road we are going to face severe economic problems if we do not deal with it.

I would just like to say to my colleagues, you know, every single time this issue comes up, back home on television and throughout this country people hear us, some of us, making these comments about Nazis, about bigotry, about racism. This is not about any of those things. It is about the law. We are a nation of laws and not of men, and if we wink at the law and let illegal immigration continue unabated, then we are not doing our jobs.

So I say to my colleagues, think about that when you cast votes on these issues. If you do not like this amendment, then come up with ideas of your own to deal with this. Let us deal with it, because the American people demand it.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is fairly interesting to note that the gentleman from Pennsylvania stood up here and said, "Well, maybe this is not the most artfully crafted amendment." But what he meant to tell you was the amendment says that we are going to have the middle class, probably the way upper class, lower middle class, lower who or whatever class we want to refer to paying for local educational agencies to determine the number of students enrolled who are not lawfully in the United States. I am quoting from the Rohrabacher amendment.

How do they propose to do that? Well, they do not tell us that, not in this amendment. What do you reckon that your local school district is going to have to do? Well, they are going to have to assign some people, I suppose, to holding due-process hearings to determine the resident legal status of children that attend that school. The child may not even be sure that the child himself or herself is foreign born, may not be, and does not necessarily mean that that individual is a legal resident of the United States.

I suggest to you that it is not only not crafted artfully, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] put it, I think the amendment is a disaster.

I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, who says that we need to get away from all of the other kinds of issues and look at the amendment and talk about who pays, that he is right in the sense that we ought to be talking about who pays. We will all pay.

This amendment is not well thought out. It is exactly the kind of amend-

ment that I think is intended to make headlines. It is intended to say you are either for stopping illegal immigration or you are against it, and we are going to put it on the schools this time, or we will put it, as the majority leader pointed out in his earlier statements this afternoon, or we will put it on some agency who is providing assistance or help to the most impoverished and perhaps the least wealthy and the least able to take care of themselves in our society and America.

So I suggest to all of my colleagues that you read the amendment. When you read the amendment, you will know the correct vote is "no."

I know that there will be those that think they have got to worry about the headline back home. Remember what the majority leader said earlier this afternoon; the majority leader said if we want to deal with the immigration issue, let us deal with it through the Immigration Service.

When was the last time a Member on the other side of the aisle, and I am pointing to the Republican Party in this case, came up with an amendment that increased the funding for the INS?

I think that is a part of the problem, because they say, "Well, we are conservative. We do not want to spend money." They also do not want to go back and tell the voters it is going to cost more money, and the truth of the matter is if you are going to enforce the immigration policy in this country, it is going to cost money. It is not free.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] last year offered an amendment to increase the amount of money for the INS. How many of you voted for it?

Mr. COLEMAN. I did, and it passed you may remember.

Mr. WALKER. Well, you asked the question, and I am giving you the answer. That was a Republican who sponsored it. It was a Republican who brought it on the floor.

Mr. COLEMAN. That was for more Border Patrol men; that was for more Border Patrol men. I will say to you that what is important here is if you keep on that tack, let us see if you vote for this one this time. We are going to have another amendment out here when we bring the appropriations bill on Justice, Commerce, and State, and we will see if you vote for the amendment and for the appropriations bill; instead of offering a 1 percent across-the-board cut this time, why do you not put your money where your mouth is?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. VALENTINE). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of

words and yield all my time for closing arguments to the maker of the amendment, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a very valuable debate today. I am sorry that every time we discuss an issue that I believe is really important to our country—and I know the people who are watching on C-SPAN and reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they too know trying to get control of the flow of illegal aliens in to our country is vital to the well-being of themselves and their families.

As far as these people are concerned, they are not racists. I am sorry that every time we discuss this we have to be basically called a bunch of names and implied we are the same as the Nazis and everything like that. The American people have a good spirit, and they are very generous people. They do not mind helping. We provide basically a generous, a very generous immigration law so that people can come here legally from all countries of the world, from all races. And I think it is a wonderful thing. And I voted for the last immigration bill, which was a very generous immigration bill. But the idea that they do not want the millions of people who are coming here illegally to receive the same benefits and thus encouraging even more people to come here and dilute those funds, and that makes them some kind of Nazis or Fascists, this is a disservice to the American people and it is a disservice to the debate on this vital issue.

I believe people of good will can disagree on things like this, and they should disagree in good will and realize that you can talk about a problem that concerns us, that deals with legality—we have heard it constantly said, we have been told that the Supreme Court said that we have to fund education for illegal aliens. The Supreme Court does not say that we cannot count illegal aliens to find out how many illegal aliens are in our schools so we can figure out the cost. The Supreme Court does not say that.

What I need to ask—when people are up there talking about basically implying that we are a bunch of Nazis and Fascists, we are trying to get control of the illegal alien situation, does that mean that no immigration laws are going to be enforced? Is that what you want? Does that mean, for example, that all children of illegal aliens, illegal immigrant children who come here, that they should not be deported with their families? Is that what we are saying, that the immigration law is right out the window? And if you believe in enforcing them, you are some kind of a Nazi? That is obviously not going to help the situation get any better.

By the way, we are making immigration policy here. When we say we are

going to provide a benefit package for people who come here from another country illegally and they are going to get so much money, we are giving them an incentive to come here, that is immigration policy because we are giving them the incentive to come here. It is not a hard thing to understand that concept and who we are supposed to be representing.

This amendment, by the way, just to note for the last gentleman who talked, we did try to authorize the funds that were necessary to implement this, as I repeat again, inconsequential, minimum funds. We already ask kids their health, the history of their health situation, we ask kids about the residency of their parents, we ask kids about the income of their parents. Just to add to that list two questions at minimal cost, yet the bottom line is if we—two of the questions are minimal cost. But if we tried to handle that objection and the other side voted it down, they would not even let us authorize the money if there was not money.

Let me just end with this: The American people are watching, and they are listening. They understand people of good will can be concerned about this, we are not a bunch of racists because we want to control our borders, we want to get control of our borders. And people do not come here and consume the benefit package that they worked their lives to build. Anyone from the southwestern States, especially, where we suffer so much under this, no one who votes against this bill says we cannot even count the number of illegal aliens in our system, no one should come back here and say, "Oh, the Federal Government has to pick up a share of the cost because it is overwhelming our systems." Do not come back—because a vote like that will be betraying the citizens in our part of the country because now we cannot quantify the problem. Thus the Federal Government can never come back and help us.

So, a vote against the Rohrabacher amendment is a vote saying the Federal Government is never going to help us out in the Western and Southwestern States to help pick up the funds.

My own solution is different. My own solution would be that illegal aliens should not be given benefit packages at all. But whether you are for the Federal Government providing some help for the States inundated by illegal aliens, or whether you say that nobody, or the Federal Government should be providing those services, you should be supporting this amendment which will help us come to grips with this problem that threatens the well-being of our people.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, we expect a lot out of our teachers in America today.

We expect them to be educators and role models.

Counselors and motivators.

Babysitters and disciplinarians.
And we ask them to do all that in the face of:
Budget cuts and metal detectors.
Turf wars and teenage angst.
Decreasing resources, and increasing diversity.

And even with all that, most of them do a wonderful job.

But the gentleman from California feels like our teachers don't do enough.

That they don't have enough responsibility.
So he wants teachers and school districts to get into the Perry Mason business.

He doesn't just want them to be trained in reading, writing, and arithmetic.

He wants them to be trained as agents of the INS.

Instead of spending money on computers and books, he wants to require schools to set up INS offices next to the lunchroom.

And instead of just checking hall passes, he wants every last teacher to spend their days checking immigration papers.

Make no mistake about it, that's what this amendment does.

It not only requires schools to conduct investigations of their own students to make sure they're legal. It requires schools to investigate whether or not their parents are legal as well.

Mr. Chairman, this is not what schools are for.

This amendment not only turns teachers into INS agents. It does so without providing so much as a dime of Federal money to do it.

Let me say that one more time, Mr. Chairman. This amendment requires all of this—the investigations, the background checks, the constant monitoring by teachers—without providing so much as a dime of Federal money to help.

Mr. Chairman, talk about double standards.
Talk about red tape.

Talk about unfunded mandates.
This amendment is the mother load of all unfunded mandates.

But above everything else, this amendment does one substantial, unforgivable thing.

One thing that no government should ever be a party to:

This amendment codifies discrimination.

Ask yourself this: how are teachers supposed to decide who is legal and who isn't?

How are they supposed to decide who to check and who not to check?

Will it be based strictly on appearances?

Will every student who doesn't have blond hair and blue eyes be forced to line up in the gym and flash their papers?

Will every student who speaks with an accent be forced to go before a review board?

Or will teachers just randomly pick students out of study halls and recess lines who don't look quite right?

Is that how it works?

Mr. Chairman, what kind of message does that send to the other students?

That it's OK to discriminate?

That it's OK to suspect somebody's guilty of wrongdoing just because they look different or sound different?

That it's OK to presume that others are guilty until proven innocent?

Mr. Chairman, maybe I come from the old school.

I believe teachers should focus on report cards, not green cards.

I believe they should prepare all of our students for the future, not just a select few.

Let's be honest: This amendment won't improve our schools or increase our test scores.

It won't drive out the gangs or confiscate the guns.

And it will do nothing to reduce the flow of illegal immigration.

All this amendment will do is divert our teachers away from teaching.

And burden State and local budgets.

With more redtape.

More bureaucracy.

More reports.

And more unfunded mandates that they can't afford.

Above all, it unleashes a kind of scholastic McCarthyism that allows our students to be investigated any time, any place, and anywhere.

Mr. Chairman, a first grade classroom is not the place to interrogate students and enforce immigration laws.

We have other agencies to do that.

We need realistic approaches to solve our immigration problems.

But this amendment is nothing but a cost-shifting, teacher-exploiting, student discriminating amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Rohrabacher and Roth amendments to H.R. 6, "Improving America's Schools Act."

None of these proposed amendments would be anything to improve America's schools. In fact, these proposals would impose huge, unfunded Federal mandates on States and local school districts. These amendments would deprive thousands of educationally disadvantaged children of the services they so desperately need.

The first Rohrabacher amendment would require every school, in order to be eligible for Federal education funding, to identify and collect data on the citizenship status of every student and his or her parents. This would not improve our schools. To the contrary it would only impose an unworkable, administrative nightmare on already overburdened school districts.

The second Rohrabacher amendment goes even further by seeking to undermine constitutional principles. The amendment would undercut the 1982 Supreme Court decision in *Plyler versus Doe*, mandating States to provide public education to all children. The amendment would deny Federal funds to States, but still require States to provide all children with an education.

The Roth amendments seek to severely weaken, and ultimately eliminate the title VII programs, which were passed by the bipartisan leadership of the Education and Labor Committee. These title VII programs are proven to be the best way to teach children with limited English proficiency English language skills.

Every major educational organization in this Nation is opposed to these senseless and unconstitutional amendments.

The Clinton administration and Secretary of Education Richard Riley have stated that these amendments are unfair, unworkable and unwise, and strongly urge us to reject them.

We must remember the most important point of this debate. We are talking about children. Children who want to learn, learn about American history, learn about English, learn about math, about science, about art—all that we can teach them.

We have a chance before us to do the right thing: To ensure that every child in this country is treated fairly and with compassion; to encourage them to grow into productive American citizens that will lead our Nation into the next century; to be competitive global leaders in an increasingly complex global marketplace. By voting against both the Rohrabacher and Roth amendments, we ensure that America will continue to be the leader and that our children, all our children, will be educated to the best of their and our ability.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Rohrabacher amendment.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been a vital source of Federal funding for our public school systems, particularly for disadvantaged youth.

This politically motivated amendment would effectively defeat the true purpose of the act and impose additional and unnecessary administrative burdens. It is an unfunded Federal mandate that will neither improve our schools nor address Federal immigration policies.

There are those who have argued that a census count of undocumented students is a minor administrative duty. I assure you, however, that in communities such as Los Angeles, it will be very difficult, if not impossible, to verify the immigration status of all students and their parents. Our school districts already lack sufficient resources to meet the educational needs of our children. They are not in a position, nor should they be placed in a position, to do the work of the INS.

The anti-immigrant climate apparently has no boundaries within reason or humanity. This amendment will only harm our schools and should be defeated.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Rohrabacher amendment. Let's be clear about what we are doing here. This is not a simple effort to account for native born and immigrant children in our schools, as supporters suggest. This is not a benign attempt to count children's heads. No, this is a shameful and mean-spirited attempt to single out and penalize the innocent children of immigrants.

With this amendment, we will transform our Nation's educators into immigration police. We would tell our Nation's teachers, principals, and counselors to put aside their books, their training, and put on a badge. Put aside your commitment to education, and start enforcing our immigration laws.

Mr. Chairman, let's also be clear about who will become suspect. As my friend from Colorado has suggested, it wouldn't be children like those of the sponsor of this amendment who would come under scrutiny. The fair haired and fair skinned could go on with their studies without fear of retribution. For kids who look like me, kids who speak with an accent, as I do, our schools would become something else altogether. This amendment will make suspect Latino, African-American, and Asian American children, and no others. For them, our schools would become a fearful place indeed.

In coming into this Chamber today, I thought that we were here to discuss the improvement of our schools. I thought that we were voting on the hard work and commitment of my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee. Instead, this amendment drags us through yet another ugly debate on immigration. Here we are again being forced to respond to misperceptions, half truths, and crude generalizations. When will this stop? When will we stop singling out immigrants for all the ills of our Nation? When will we again appreciate the blood, sweat, and tears that immigrants contribute to this country? When will that beautiful statue in the New York harbor again be a source of pride, and not a reminder of how far we have fallen?

This amendment is not only immoral, it directly contradicts one of the most enlightened and humane decisions of the Supreme Court. In *Plyler versus Doe*, the Court concluded that it was abhorrent to our great Constitution to deny an education to innocent children because of their immigration status. All students are entitled to a public education. The Court was right then and it is still right today.

The kids in our schools, immigrant and native born alike, are our future. Denying some immigrant children an education outright, or creating a fearful atmosphere that would keep them from coming to the classroom, denies them their future and in turn denies this country its future. By depriving them of an education, these immigrants will never be able to become tomorrow's hardworking citizens and taxpayers. Instead, they would become tomorrow's unemployed and destitute.

We as a nation cannot afford to squander our human resources. We cannot throw away our immigrant children. I ask my colleagues to defeat this shameful amendment.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I am here today to speak in opposition to the Rohrabacher amendment.

It is interesting that my colleague who often times bemoans Federal mandates as burdensome and intrusive, would create a huge bureaucracy for our Nation's schools. Rather than focusing energy and resources for title I programs, my colleague asks school districts to become Federal immigration investigators and data collectors.

It would be wrong to use our school systems as immigration police for the Federal Government. Equally important, we must remember that the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that school districts may not gather citizenship information from their student population.

I can't imagine that parents and teachers want to divert school districts' resources from students to downtown bureaucracies. In southern California, which has a large title I population, our school districts are working valiantly to get their students, teachers, classrooms, and schools back together following our devastating earthquake. They need support as educators, not as investigators and bureaucrats.

Please allow public schools to do the huge task that is before them: provide education that is challenging and enriching to all of our children. Vote "no" on the Rohrabacher amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by

the gentleman from California requiring the reporting of the residency/citizenship status of children and their parents by school districts before receiving title I funds. This new bureaucratic requirement and unfunded mandate would, in effect deputize our schools and educational professionals into service for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. We cannot afford to spend the already scarce resources for education on the enforcement of immigration law.

I've been an educator for most of my life and I can tell you from personal experience that school personnel do not need another Federal mandate taking them away from their primary duty of teaching our children, particularly one which in effect makes them law enforcers. But this amendment not only requires that the legal status of each student be assessed, it also requires a report on the status of their parents. The question is why do we want to continue to overburden the schools with additional activities that are not directly connected to the welfare of children.

And where do we stop with the enforcement of law and policy; do we want to use children and their need to learn and the natural parental desire for educational advancement as the basis for the enforcement of other laws; do we want to start questioning kindergartners about what their parents do or own in the hope of catching adults in an illegal activity; do we want to use the schoolhouse as the basis for the investigation of crimes and the implementation of policies for which enforcement agencies already exist?

Most ominously, this amendment could lead to witch hunts, as schools single out children who do not look typically American, even if they do not require documentation. Such children might include the people I represent and Puerto Ricans and others who are native-born U.S. citizens. It may also single out Hispanics and Asians who have been here for generations. One of the possible effects of this amendment might be that all of us non-typical American looking types may be forced to carry documentation so as not to be misidentified by educational personnel as illegal immigrants.

This is nothing more than lashing out at a population of foreigner; this is allowing emotion to reign in what is a very serious debate; and you know what is most bothersome—is that this is not in the best tradition of what makes America great.

When you look at this debate, you see two great forces which make America stand out among the nations of the world—an immigration history which has been open and welcoming and which has provided opportunities to some Members of this body who are themselves first generation immigrants and to the sons and daughters, grandsons and granddaughters of immigrants who I'm sure make up the majority of the membership of this body.

That legacy in combination with the quest for educational opportunity and the historical record of providing common schooling for children of whatever origin has accounted for much of America's present greatness. Educational opportunity and its expansion for immigrants and the children of immigrants as well as native-born have been the engines of progress in American history.

In seeking to amend an educational opportunity bill for these purposes, we see the two great forces for American progress—immigration and the expansion of educational opportunity—blunted, used and abused, perverted to block the very things which has made America the Nation that it is today.

Clearly what America is today and its historical experiences to date are being ignored and discarded by these amendments.

We need to talk about immigration policy and we need to deal with the issue of controlling the borders, but to use schools as the vehicles and children as the pawns in the process is not right and we know it.

Vote down the Rohrabacher amendment.

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the small State title I funding provisions of Mr. Kildee's en bloc amendment to H.R. 6, and I offer my sincere thanks to Chairman FORD, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. GOODLING for their help in reaching a compromise on this issue. This provision is about equity. Without it, the five smallest States in this country would suffer great losses in crucial title I, funding. While most States receive far more than one-quarter of 1 percent under title I, New Hampshire, Delaware, Vermont, Alaska, and Wyoming do not receive even close to one-quarter of 1 percent to operate the largest Federal program for elementary and secondary education.

This provision will not have a noticeable effect on any of the other States—approximately .11 percent or \$5.8 million of the \$7 billion program—but will mean a great deal to the disadvantaged students in each of these smaller States. This provision will make it possible for these States to continue to offer effective programs for their title I children.

In many States, 1990 census numbers do not accurately reflect the number of disadvantaged students that need to be served under title I. Because of these census figures, New Hampshire and many other States stand to lose title I dollars in the next fiscal year, with further and greater losses in subsequent years. These losses will be completely devastating to title I programs in such States.

The small States provisions of the en bloc amendment will not impact the funding reduction these States will suffer next year, but it will improve their situation in subsequent years. Title I is designed to help economically and scholastically disadvantaged students in poor areas. This modest provision maintains the critical mass of funds necessary if title I is to make a difference in our States. Without it, small States will be unable to carry out the intent of title I programs. This change to H.R. 6 will not equitably distribute moneys to the areas in these small States that so desperately need it.

Mr. Speaker, every student deserves an equal opportunity to learn. I commend Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GOODLING, and Chairman FORD for helping to ensure an equal opportunity to learn for the children in my State. It was a pleasure working with them on this provision, and I thank them for their support.

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of ensuring that parental involvement is a No. 1 priority in all areas of education reform. As we consider H.R. 6, Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, I urge

each and every one of you to vote in favor of amendments that promote parental involvement in the education of their children.

Education is the building block for continued success in our Nation. And that education begins at home. With the support, encouragement, discipline, and love of involved parents, children will easily reach the first national education goal of the administration's Goals 2000 Act, that "all children in America will start school ready to learn."

Today, Congressman ALAN WHEAT is offering an amendment that would give local education agencies the option to use funds, from the 1 percent set-aside of title 1 funds for parental involvement, for the Parents as Teachers Program. In my own First District of Arkansas, we have three parents as teachers programs which, through the instructional materials, group meetings, and home visits provided by this program, have made a great difference in these children's lives. A national 1985 independent evaluation of Parents as Teachers found that participating children were significantly more advanced than other 3-year-olds in language and social development, problem-solving and other intellectual skills. A 1989 follow-up study of these same children found that they were still ahead in first grade, as measured by teacher reports and standardized tests.

Programs such as Parents as Teachers are based on the belief that parents are children's first and most important teachers. Because we must ensure that our children are ready to learn when they enter school, I urge my colleagues to support truly worthwhile programs such as this one which promote the importance of parental involvement in their children's education.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the more than 2,000 constituents who took the time to write or place phone calls to my office, I rise in strong support of the Arney amendment to protect home schoolers and private schools. The Arney amendment eliminates any certification requirement for private, religious and home schools. In addition, it precludes interference with continued Catholic and parochial school participation in Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs.

As both President Clinton and Dr. William Bennett have observed, "Governments don't raise children, parents do."

I firmly believe in and support the right of parents to determine the best schooling option for their children, whether that choice be private, religious, home or public school. Thousands of families today have opted out of public schools. Some sought relief from the mandates placed on public education by the Federal Government. Some sought refuge from increasing violence in public schools. All have made the decision that the quality of education they wish to provide for their children cannot be found in the public school system. Such parents are simply exercising their appropriate freedoms in making choices that are rightly reserved for them. This Congress must protect the right of parents to enroll their children in private schools or educate their children in a home school. These parents have the constitutional right as Americans to educate their children in the manner they choose because they are in a better position to know the needs

of their children than are any bureaucrats here in Washington, DC.

As every Member of this body knows, parents are rightly demanding reforms in our education system. Among those reforms are parental choice, local control, better schools, safer schools, and freedom from Federal regulations and Federal money with strings attached. Mr. Chairman, I believe adequate regulations are already in place on the State and local level for private schools and home schools. Parents who care enough to pay the added cost of a private school, or expend countless hours educating their children at home, do not need the Federal Government second-guessing their every move.

While I supported the Ford amendment, it did not go far enough to affirm the rights of parents. The Arney amendment is needed to protect all home schoolers, including those in the 17 States where home schooling is proscribed by State law and defined as private schooling.

I urge my colleagues to ensure the rights of parents, to ensure the rightful independence of home schools and private schools, and to make the record absolutely clear by passing the Arney amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the children of this country should be a priority. No one in this body would argue against this.

A solid education is a fundamental tool that our children take with them into adulthood, moving into the work force and leading our society.

The amendment before us in no way jeopardizes or undermines the goal of providing a good education to the children of this Nation. Mr. ROHRBACHER's amendment simply seeks to restrict Federal aid from going to those who are in our country illegally.

This is simply an amendment about priorities. Specifically, economic priorities.

The taxpayers already pay for a host of social services available to those who break our laws to enter our country. This is a drain on finite resources that should be spent on the taxpaying citizens and legal residents of this country who live within the boundaries of the law.

The Rohrabacher amendment will simply prevent finite Federal resources from going to those who have chosen to live outside of the boundaries of these laws. The Federal Government should not be in the business of educating children who not only are here illegally, but cannot ever work in this country legally.

Ms. LONG. Mr. Chairman, as chair of the Congressional Rural Caucus, I am opposed to the Boehner amendment which would eliminate much needed assistance for rural schools.

Approximately 60 percent of our country's public school districts are rural. Rural schools face unique challenges to providing adequate educational services including poverty, geographic isolation, and teacher recruitment.

In fact, the General Accounting Office recently reported that the rural school-age poverty rate rose to 20.4 percent in 1990, well above the 1990 urban rate of 16 percent. Rural schools also face logistical difficulties due to geographic isolation. More often than not, rural schools cannot offer the variety and depth of courses commonly available in metro-

politan areas, or target programs to specific groups, furthermore, rural schools have difficulty recruiting and retaining qualified teachers.

However, these problems are not insurmountable; the difficulties rural schools face, can be remedied through additional attention and funding. The Rural and Urban Education Assistance Program would assist rural school districts in undertaking genuine school reform, preparing more rural graduates for higher education and vocational training, and training and recruiting teachers. It would also enable rural school districts to use the most advanced telecommunications technologies for learning.

Title 12 of H.R. 6 is an important and essential step in addressing the education needs of rural America and rural children. For these reasons, I am opposed to the Boehner amendment to strike this program.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise just to announce we will probably have three more amendments after this for which there will be no rollcall requested.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 78, noes 329, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

AYES—78

Archer	Fawell	Miller (FL)
Arney	Fields (TX)	Molinari
Baker (CA)	Fowler	Myers
Baker (LA)	Franks (CT)	Oxley
Ballenger	Franks (NJ)	Packard
Bartlett	Galleghy	Paxon
Bereuter	Gingrich	Petri
Boehner	Goodlatte	Pombo
Bunning	Goss	Ravenel
Burton	Grams	Rogers
Buyer	Hancock	Rohrabacher
Callahan	Hastert	Roth
Coble	Herger	Royce
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Schaefer
Combest	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Crapo	Kim	Shuster
Cunningham	Kingston	Smith (OR)
Deal	Linder	Smith (TX)
DeLay	McCandless	Solomon
Doolittle	McCollum	Spence
Dorman	McHugh	Stearns
Dreier	McInnis	Stump
Duncan	Meyers	Walker
Dunn	Mica	Zeliff
Everett	Michel	Zimmer

NOES—329

Abercrombie	Barlow	Billakis
Ackerman	Barrett (NE)	Bishop
Allard	Barrett (WI)	Blackwell
Andrews (ME)	Barton	Blute
Andrews (NJ)	Becerra	Boehert
Bacchus (FL)	Beilenson	Bonilla
Bachus (AL)	Bentley	Bonior
Baessler	Berman	Borski
Barca	Bevill	Boucher
Barcia	Bilbray	Brewster

Brooks	Houghton	Pastor
Browder	Hoyer	Payne (NJ)
Brown (CA)	Huffington	Payne (VA)
Brown (FL)	Hughes	Pelosi
Brown (OH)	Hutchinson	Penny
Bryant	Hutto	Peterson (FL)
Byrne	Hyde	Peterson (MN)
Calvert	Inglis	Pickett
Camp	Inhofe	Pickle
Canady	Inslee	Pomeroy
Cantwell	Jacobs	Porter
Cardin	Johnson (GA)	Portman
Carr	Johnson (SD)	Poshard
Castle	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Chapman	Johnston	Pryce (OH)
Clay	Kanjorski	Quinn
Clayton	Kaptur	Rahall
Clement	Kasich	Ramstad
Clyburn	Kennedy	Rangel
Coleman	Kennelly	Reed
Collins (MI)	Kildee	Regula
Condit	King	Reynolds
Conyers	Kleczka	Richardson
Cooper	Klein	Ridge
Coppersmith	Klink	Roberts
Costello	Klug	Roemer
Coyne	Knollenberg	Romero-Barcelo
Cramer	Kolbe	(PR)
Crane	Kopetski	Ros-Lehtinen
Danner	Kreidler	Rose
Darden	Kyl	Roukema
de Lugo (VI)	LaFalce	Rowland
DeFazio	Lambert	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Lancaster	Rush
Derrick	Lantos	Sabo
Deutsch	LaRocco	Sanders
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Sangmeister
Dickey	Leach	Santorum
Dingell	Lehman	Sarpalius
Dixon	Levin	Sawyer
Dooley	Levy	Saxton
Durbin	Lewis (CA)	Schenk
Edwards (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Schroeder
Edwards (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
Ehlers	Lightfoot	Scott
Emerson	Lipinski	Serrano
Engel	Livingston	Sharp
English	Lloyd	Shays
Eshoo	Long	Shepherd
Evans	Lowey	Sisisky
Ewing	Machtley	Skaggs
Faleomavaega	Maloney	Skeen
(AS)	Mann	Skelton
Farr	Manton	Slattery
Fazio	Manzullo	Slaughter
Fields (LA)	Margolies-	Smith (IA)
Filner	Mezvinsky	Smith (MI)
Fingerhut	Markey	Smith (NJ)
Fish	Martinez	Snowe
Flake	Matsui	Spratt
Foglietta	Mazzoli	Stark
Ford (MI)	McCloskey	Stenholm
Ford (TN)	McCrery	Stokes
Frank (MA)	McCurdy	Strickland
Frost	McDermott	Studds
Gedjenson	McHale	Stupak
Gekas	McKeon	Sundquist
Gephardt	McKinney	Swett
Geren	McMillan	Swift
Gibbons	Meek	Synar
Gilchrest	Menendez	Talent
Gillmor	Mfume	Tanner
Gilman	Mineta	Tauzin
Glickman	Minge	Taylor (MS)
Gonzalez	Mink	Tejeda
Goodling	Moakley	Thomas (WY)
Gordon	Mollohan	Thompson
Gunderson	Montgomery	Thornton
Gutierrez	Moorhead	Thurman
Hall (OH)	Moran	Torkildsen
Hall (TX)	Morella	Torres
Hamburg	Murphy	Torricelli
Hamilton	Murtha	Towns
Hansen	Nadler	Trafcant
Hayes	Neal (MA)	Tucker
Hefley	Neal (NC)	Underwood (GU)
Hefner	Norton (DC)	Unsoeld
Hilliard	Nussle	Upton
Hinche	Oberstar	Valentine
Hoagland	Obey	Velazquez
Hobson	Oliver	Vento
Hochbrueckner	Ortiz	Visclosky
Hoekstra	Orton	Volkmer
Hoke	Owens	Walsh
Holden	Pallone	Waters
Horn	Parker	Watt

Waxman	Wilson	Wynn
Weldon	Wise	Yates
Wheat	Wolf	Young (AK)
Whitten	Woolsey	Young (FL)
Williams	Wyden	

NOT VOTING—31

Andrews (TX)	Grandy	Miller (CA)
Applegate	Green	Natcher
Bateman	Greenwood	Quillen
Bliley	Harman	Rostenkowski
Clinger	Hastings	Schiff
Collins (IL)	Jefferson	Taylor (NC)
de la Garza	Johnson (CT)	Thomas (CA)
Dellums	Laughlin	Vucanovich
Dicks	McDade	Washington
Furse	McNulty	
Gallo	Meehan	

□ 1709

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taylor of North Carolina for, with Mr. Miller against.

Mr. Thomas of California for, with Mr. Gene Green of Texas against.

Ms. CANTWELL and Messrs. WALSH, CHAPMAN, and THOMAS of Wyoming changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MILLER of Florida changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1710

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just address the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] for the purpose of dealing with the schedule for next week and for a colloquy with the distinguished majority leader.

If I might have the Members' attention, there has been at least one change in the schedule, and the error was on my part. I apologize to all the Members, so they will not be mad at the majority.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there will not be further votes this evening. Votes are finished for today. There will be a discussion of a few other amendments, but there will not be votes.

There will not be votes on Friday, and on Monday, March 7, the House will meet at noon. There will be no Morning Business, no legislative business.

On Tuesday, March 8, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for Morning Business. It is my understanding that there will then be a recess, and there will then be one bill on suspension. The recorded vote on that bill, which is the Federal Work Force Restructuring Act of 1993, H.R. 3345, will not be held on

Tuesday but will be derailed until Wednesday. However, it is my understanding there may be the possibility of a procedural vote or votes later in the day on Tuesday.

Mr. FROST. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, Tuesday is the date of the Texas primary. There are 30 Members of Congress from Texas, both Democrats and Republicans. In the past, it has been customary, when there is a large State primary, and this is just the first of many large State primaries this year, for the leadership on both sides to attempt to accommodate those Members and not have votes of any kind on those days.

I would ask the gentleman, do I understand that will not be the case this time?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, obviously, that is our attempt. We do not always accomplish that, and we have attempted to accommodate every primary. It is impossible to do all of them. Obviously, there is not the ability, without a complete agreement, to save people from every possible procedural vote or quorum call. I can assure the Members that there will not be a legislative day on that day. There may be a quorum call. There may be an adjournment vote. We can never guarantee Members that that will not happen.

Mr. FROST. If the gentleman will continue to yield, do I understand, and I am trying to make sure that I have a clear picture, that our side of the aisle, the Democratic side of the aisle, is not going to ask for any votes, even procedural votes, on Tuesday?

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is correct.

Mr. FROST. If there are any votes, the request would be made on the other side, on the Republican side?

Mr. GINGRICH. I might say to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], I tried to make that clear when I said there had been a miscommunication earlier about this particular day, and that I take the responsibility for having made an error. I apologize to those Members who I have made an error. I apologize to those Members who I have miscommunicated with.

I would also point out there are many States that have primaries. All those States are as important as Texas to themselves, hard to believe, and on a number of occasions we actually have votes on days we have primaries, but we are agreeable to meeting late and trying to have any votes which do occur as late in the day as possible for those Members who do have to come back from Texas and are inconvenienced.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to my friend, the other gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON], who also wants to express umbrage, I believe.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] and tell the Members that I am not happy with this decision, either. I thought that we always protected the rights of our individuals in this Chamber when it was voting day. I would hope that we could continue to do it in the future. I am disappointed if we cannot do it in the case of Texas.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, on Wednesday, March 9, we will meet at 2 p.m. We will be taking up H.R. 3345, the Federal Work Force Restructuring Act of 1993, the vote on that, although it will be debated on Tuesday.

We will be taking up again H.R. 6, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1993, to complete consideration; S. 636, the motion to go to conference on Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act, subject to a rule; and the resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1995, subject to a rule. Conference reports can be brought up at any time.

It is our hope that we will not need to be here or have votes on Friday, but I cannot give an iron-clad assurance, because we do want to get these matters finished.

Mr. GINGRICH. If I might, just to remind Members, as I understand it, we would go in on Tuesday at 10:30, have the morning hour, recess, and probably come back in at about 3 o'clock for the legislative business, and any procedural votes that might occur would probably be rolled until after that 3 o'clock coming back in?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I would say to the gentleman, if there is a procedural or a quorum call vote, it would be in the 4 to 5 o'clock period before it would start.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the majority leader.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOAGLAND

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOAGLAND:

Page 49, line 24, strike "and".

Page 50, line 12, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 50, line 13, strike "Notwithstanding" and insert "notwithstanding".

Page 50, line 19, strike the period and insert "; and" and add after that line the following:

"(4) to the extent feasible, use funds received under this part to serve educationally deprived children who reside in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families or who are under a school desegregation plan and who otherwise meet the eligibility requirements of this part and who attend schools in noneligible attendance areas.

Mr. HOAGLAND (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous

consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOAGLAND

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. HOAGLAND:

Page 50, after line 19, insert:

"(4) use funds received under this part to serve eligible children who reside in school attendance areas served under the part and who attend schools in other school attendance areas in accordance with a court-ordered school desegregation plan or a plan which continues to be implemented in accordance with a district-wide, court-ordered desegregation plan."

Mr. HOAGLAND (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, as modified, be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the modification?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today is intended to correct an important flaw in the new approach to distributing chapter 1 funds that is provided for in H.R. 6, the elementary and secondary education amendments.

The administration has decided on a policy change to concentrate chapter 1 funding to those schools with the most deserving and needy students. But the administration's bill fails to give any consideration to school districts operating under a school desegregation plan, and the result is that the proposal will penalize the very students chapter 1 is designed to help.

In Omaha, NB, there will be 1,000 public school students and 350 private school students—currently receiving chapter 1 services—who will no longer receive assistance because these students are attending a noneligible chapter 1 school because of a desegregation plan.

This is simply not fair.

In Omaha, students from low-income areas of the city who attend Dundee Elementary School or Washington Elementary School or Belle Ryan or Western Hills Elementary School may very well need the extra boost a remedial reading program would provide them. They should not get left behind just because the school districts in their city operate under a desegregation plan and so do not fit into the administration's criteria for concentrated help.

I think we should not prejudice those students.

Last, if we do not correct this policy in the bill, it may discourage further integration of our schools, and that would not make any sense. Our community has made great strides toward integration and we are quite proud of our efforts. It does not make any sense to penalize school districts and students in their efforts to integrate our schools.

In closing, I want to reiterate my concern for the 1,350 students in my congressional district who would not receive chapter 1 services without the adoption of this amendment. I think it is essential that it be adopted for the sake of those students and their families.

□ 1720

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. VALENTINE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOAGLAND], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. HOAGLAND:

Page 49, line 24, strike "and".

Page 50, line 12, strike the period and insert "and".

Page 50 line 13, strike "Notwithstanding" and insert "notwithstanding".

Page 50, after line 19, insert:

"(4) use funds received under this part to serve eligible children who reside in school attendance areas served under the part and who attend schools in other school attendance areas in accordance with a court-ordered school desegregation plan or a plan which continues to be implemented in accordance with a district-wide, court-ordered desegregation plan."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ACKERMAN

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ACKERMAN:

Page 49, line 24, strike "and".

Page 50, line 12, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 50, line 13, strike "Notwithstanding" and insert "notwithstanding".

Page 50, line 19, strike the period and insert "; and" and add after that line the following:

"(4) to the extent feasible, use funds received under this part to serve educationally deprived children who reside in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families and who otherwise meet the eligibility requirements of this part and who attend schools in noneligible attendance areas.

Mr. ACKERMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ACKERMAN

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment with the language at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. ACKERMAN: Page 49, line 24, strike "and".

Page 50, line 12, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 50, line 13, strike "Notwithstanding" and insert "notwithstanding".

Page 50, line 19, strike the period and insert "; and" and add after that line the following:

"(4) in LEA's that have over 900,000 students, to the extent feasible, use funds received under this part to serve educationally deprived children who reside in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families and who otherwise meet the eligibility requirements of this part and who attend schools in noneligible attendance areas.

Mr. ACKERMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, as modified, be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the modification?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment further modifies the bill to accommodate some of the inequities that some of us feel are in the bill, and I believe that we have the cooperation of the majority and the minority.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and I have looked at this amendment and we have no problem with it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHEAT

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHEAT:

Page 406, after line 18, insert the following:

"PART J—PARENTS AS TEACHERS"

"SEC. 3941. SHORT TITLE.

"This part may be cited as the 'Parents as Teachers: the Family Involvement in Education Act of 1994'.

"SEC. 3942. FINDINGS.

"The Congress finds—

"(1) increased parental involvement in the education of their children appears to be the key to long-term gains for youngsters;

"(2) providing seed money is an appropriate role for the Federal Government to play in education;

"(3) children participating in the parents as teachers program in Missouri are found to have increased cognitive or intellectual skills, language ability, social skills and other predictors of school success;

"(4) most early childhood programs begin at age 3 or 4 when remediation may already be necessary; and

"(5) many children receive no health screening between birth and the time they enter school, thus such children miss the opportunity of having developmental delays detected early.

"SEC. 3943. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

"It is the purpose of this part to encourage States to develop and expand parent and early childhood education programs in an effort to—

"(1) increase parents' knowledge of and confidence in child-rearing activities, such as teaching and nurturing their young children;

"(2) strengthen partnerships between parents and schools; and

"(3) enhance the developmental progress of participating children.

"SEC. 3944. DEFINITIONS.

"For the purposes of this part—

"(1) the term 'developmental screening' means the process of measuring the progress of children to determine if there are problems or potential problems or advanced abilities in the areas of understanding and use of language, perception through sight, perception through hearing, motor development and hand-eye coordination, health, and physical development;

"(2) the term 'eligible family' means any parent with one or more children between birth and 3 years of age, or any parent expecting a child;

"(3) the term 'lead agency' means the office or agency in a State designated by the Governor to administer the parents as teachers program authorized by this part;

"(4) the term 'parent education' includes parent support activities, the provision of resource materials on child development and parent-child learning activities, private and group educational guidance, individual and group learning experiences for the parent and child, and other activities that enable the parent to improve learning in the home;

"(5) the term 'parent educator' means a person hired by the lead agency of a State or designated by local entities who administers group meetings, home visits and developmental screening for eligible families, and is trained by the Parents As Teachers National Center established under section 3948; and

"(6) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Education.

"SEC. 3945. PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States to pay the Federal share of the cost of establishing, expanding, and operating parents as teachers programs.

"(2) In awarding grants under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give special consideration to applicants whose programs primarily serve hard-to-serve populations, including—

"(A) teenaged parents,

"(B) illiterate parents,

"(C) economically disadvantaged parents,

"(D) offenders and their families,

"(E) unemployed parents,

"(F) learning disabled parents, and

"(G) non-English speaking parents.

"(3) In determining the amount of a grant under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall take into consideration the size of the population to be served, the size of the area to be served, and the financial resources of such population and area.

"(b) SPECIAL RULE.—Any State operating a parents as teachers program which is associated with the Parents As Teachers National Center located in St. Louis, Missouri, shall be eligible to receive a grant under this part.

"SEC. 3946. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Each State receiving a grant under section 3945(a) shall conduct a parents as teachers program which—

"(A) establishes and operates parent education programs including programs of developmental screening of children; and

"(B) designates a lead State agency which shall—

"(i) hire parent educators who have had supervised experience in the care and education of children;

"(ii) establish the number of group meetings and home visits required to be provided each year for each participating family, with a minimum of 4 group meetings and 8 home visits for each participating family;

"(iii) be responsible for administering the periodic screening of participating children's educational, hearing and visual development, using the Denver Developmental Test, Zimmerman Preschool Language Scale, or other approved screening instruments; and

"(iv) develop recruitment and retention programs for hard-to-reach populations.

"(2) Grants awarded section 3945(a) shall only be used for parents as teachers programs which serve families during the period of time beginning with the last 3 months of a mother's pregnancy and ending when a child attains the age of 3.

"SEC. 3947. PARENTS AS TEACHERS NATIONAL CENTER.

"The Secretary shall establish a Parents As Teachers National Center to disseminate information to, and provide technical and training assistance to, States establishing and operating parents as teachers programs.

"SEC. 3948. EVALUATIONS.

"The Secretary shall complete an evaluation of the State parents as teachers programs within 4 years from the date of enactment of this part.

"SEC. 3949. APPLICATION.

"Each State desiring a grant under section 3945(a) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require. Each such application shall describe the activities and services for which assistance is sought.

"SEC. 3950. PAYMENTS AND FEDERAL SHARE.

"(a) PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall pay to each State having an application approved under section 3949 the Federal share of the cost of the activities described in the application.

"(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—(1) The Federal share—

"(A) for the first year for which a State receives assistance under this part shall be 100 percent;

"(B) for the second such year shall be 100 percent;

"(C) for the third such year shall be 75 percent;

"(D) for the fourth such year shall be 50 percent; and

"(E) for the fifth such year 25 percent.

"(2) The non-Federal share of payments under this part may be in cash or in kind fairly evaluated, including planned equipment or services.

"SEC. 3951. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"There are authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999 to carry out this part."

Mr. WHEAT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHEAT

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment with an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modifications to amendment offered by Mr. WHEAT: Page 81, line 7, after "Even Start," insert "Parents As Teachers,"

Page 85, line 16, strike "and"

Page 85, line 19, after "systems;" insert "and"

Page 85, line 20, insert new subparagraph: "(C) in the case of a school using funds under this part to operate a preschool program, opportunities for parents to learn about child development and child rearing issues beginning at birth."

Page 87, line 5, after "Even Start," insert "Parents As Teachers."

Mr. WHEAT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modifications be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the modifications?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I would like to thank Chairman FORD and Chairman KILDEE and Ranking Member GOODLING for their commitment to improving the quality of education in this country and for their hard work in crafting this landmark bill, and I think them for their support on this amendment.

This is the Parents as Teachers amendment that allows title I funds to be used for the very positive Parents as Teachers Programs that assist parents in teaching their children skills that are useful in improving their educational abilities in early childhood.

Mr. KILDEE. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and I have looked at this amendment and we find it acceptable.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my ranking member and the chairman for this opportunity. I had an amendment, but I am going to withdraw the amendment. It had to do with modifying the opportunities for schools to move to schoolwide programs with Chapter One funds.

Under the present circumstances I understand that it takes a school that has 75 percent of their students in the low income category. This bill moves it to 60 percent, and I would by my amendment have moved it to 50 percent. I think that is the proper thing to do.

It seems to me that the biggest step we could take to improve student performance would be to give schools flexibility. The present stratification of Federal money is cumbersome and inefficient. In Wyoming we had a number of meetings with educators to discuss the Chapter One Program and how to improve it for student benefits, and their basic feeling was shared in this statement:

Many factors now used to define and monitor Chapter 1 schools fall short of helping children succeed. Whether the Chapter 1 teacher spends one period a day or two periods a day teaching non-Chapter 1 kids is arbitrary and irrelevant. If Chapter 1 children do well and other children happen to benefit, why place parameters on who teaches whom, when and how? Schools forced by perceived regulatory requirements to use only pull-out models may deny Chapter 1 students the full benefit of the regular school program.

I have been to some schools in Wyoming where chapter 1 facilities, chapter 1 teachers' times and so on were not used to their full benefit because of this restriction. However, I do have assurances from the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. KILDEE], and I appreciate it, that there would be some consideration, that this revised Chapter Two Program will not be attacked, and so I do believe perhaps I will withdraw the amendment in the hopes that the Senate will take a look at this opportunity to change it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to say that I had an amendment, as the gentleman knows, very similar to his which I have discussed with the committee, and which I have discussed with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] as well. Like the gentleman from Wyoming, I will not offer that amendment, but like him, I believe we have to look at this alternative.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with an enormously important issue:

namely, expanding eligibility for a whole-school program under title I. Many of us believe that overall school improvement is the single best way to improve achievement by disadvantaged students. An enhanced, challenging curriculum taught by well-prepared teachers is, in fact, the goal of the school reform efforts all over the country. Given that, I think we have to ask ourselves why we continue to rely on pull-out programs as the backbone of the Title I Program.

Although this amendment only drops the percentage of disadvantaged children required for a schoolwide program to 50 percent from 60 percent, it is a key step in the right direction for title I. If a school and a school district are willing to go through the planning process and meet the performance standards—for all children—that are required of a schoolwide program, I say we should encourage them. This is one of the most powerful ways in which Federal funds can encourage school improvement all over the country. I think we should take this opportunity and expand title I schoolwide eligibility, provided it is accompanied by the kind of performance standards and accountability contained in H.R. 6.

As the chairmen and ranking member know, I think we should be offering schools even more flexibility in their use of Federal funds than we do in H.R. 6 overall. This bill's framework for schoolwide title I shows us how this could be done, and I hope by the time the ESEA reauthorization is signed into law, we will have expanded eligibility to all schools that are eager to participate. This amendment takes us toward that goal.

□ 1730

If a school and a school district are willing to go through the planning process and meet the performance standards for all children that are required of the schoolwide program, I say we should encourage that acceptance of responsibility for all of the children in the school no matter what the percentage of poor children or disadvantaged children in that particular school.

This is one of the most powerful ways in which Federal funds can encourage school improvement all over the country. I think we should take this opportunity and expand title I schoolwide eligibility. It is controversial.

I know the committee has worked hard, and I am not going to offer my amendment. And I understand the gentleman himself is not going to offer it. But I look forward to working with him as this bill passes from here, and I am going to support this bill as it goes to the Senate. I am going to be an advocate of moving in the direction of making sure we utilize these funds for a broader schoolwide improvement which I think inevitably is the answer to making sure all children are lifted

with the expectations and the standards that we expect of our school system dollars that we pay, not mandate. If they do not want to take our dollars, they do not have to do it, but if they take it, then meet those standards for all children.

I thank the gentleman for his efforts, thank him for yielding, and look forward to working with him and with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] on this issue.

I think we have a tremendous opportunity this year to make a dramatic difference. I think the committee has gone in the right direction, and I congratulate them for it.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and let me get one final shot in for flexibility, making decisions where they count on the ground. Further, it is not often that I agree with the administration, and I did on this one to go to 50, so I appreciate it very much.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. VALENTINE). If there are no further amendments to title I, the Clerk will designate title II of the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The text of title II is as follows:

"TITLE II—IMPROVING TEACHING AND LEARNING

"PART A—DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

"SEC. 2101. FINDINGS.

"The Congress finds that—

"(1) reaching the National Education Goals requires a comprehensive educational reform strategy that involves parents, schools, government, communities, and other public and private organizations at all levels;

"(2) a crucial component of the strategy for achieving these goals is ensuring, through sustained and intensive high-quality professional development, and through the development and adoption of high quality curriculum, that all teachers are capable of providing challenging learning experiences in the core academic subjects for their students;

"(3) decisionmaking as to what activities a State or local educational agency should undertake to improve teaching and learning are best made by individuals in the schools closest to the classroom and most knowledgeable about the needs of schools and students;

"(4) the potential positive impact of high-quality professional development is underscored by recent research findings that—

"(A) professional development must be focused on teaching and learning in order to change the opportunities of all students to achieve higher standards; and

"(B) effective professional development focuses on discipline-based knowledge and subject-specific pedagogical skills, involves teams of teachers and administrators in a school and, through professional networks of teachers and administrators, is interactive and collaborative, motivates by its intrinsic content and relationship to practice, builds on experience and learning-by-doing, and becomes incorporated into the everyday life of the school;

"(5) engaging teachers in the development of high quality curricula is a powerful professional

development activity that improves teaching and learning;

"(6) special attention must be given in professional development activities to ensure that education professionals are knowledgeable of, and make use of, strategies for serving populations that historically have lacked access to equal opportunities for advanced learning and career advancement;

"(7) States and local educational agencies also need to engage teachers in the development of high quality curricula that are aligned with State or local content and performance standards in order to improve teaching and learning and ensure that students achieve the State standards;

"(8) professional development is often a victim of budget reductions in fiscally difficult times and curricula development is almost nonexistent in many State and local school systems; and

"(9) the Federal Government has a vital role in helping States and local educational agencies to make sustained and intensive high-quality professional development in the core academic subjects become an integral part of the elementary and secondary education system and in providing assistance to such agencies to engage teachers in the development of high quality curricula that are aligned with State or local content and performance standards.

"SEC. 2102. PURPOSES.

"The purposes of this part are to provide assistance to States and local educational agencies and to institutions of higher education with teacher education programs so that such agencies can determine how best to improve the teaching and learning of all students through—

"(1) helping to ensure that teachers, other staff, and administrators have access to sustained and intensive high-quality professional development that is aligned to challenging State content and performance standards in the core academic subjects and that—

"(A) is tied to challenging State and local curriculum content and student performance standards;

"(B) reflects recent research on teaching and learning;

"(C) incorporates effective strategies, techniques, methods, and practices for meeting the educational needs of diverse students, including females, minorities, individuals with disabilities, limited-English proficient individuals, and economically disadvantaged individuals, in order to ensure that all students have the opportunity to achieve challenging performance standards;

"(D) includes strong academic content and pedagogical components;

"(E) is of sufficient intensity and duration to have a positive and lasting impact on the teacher's performance in the classroom; and

"(F) is part of the everyday life of the school and creates an orientation toward continuous improvement throughout the school; and

"(2) assisting States and local educational agencies to engage teachers in the development of high quality curriculum that is aligned with State or local content and performance standards.

"SEC. 2103. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; ALLOCATION BETWEEN SUBPARTS.

"(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated \$800,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999.

"(b) ALLOCATION BETWEEN SUBPARTS.—Of the funds appropriated to carry out this part for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall use—

"(1) 5 percent to carry out subpart 1; and

"(2) 95 percent to carry out subpart 2.

"Subpart 1—Federal Activities

"SEC. 2111. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

"(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with, local educational agencies, State educational agencies, State agencies for higher education, educational service agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public and private agencies, other organizations, and institutions to—

"(1) support activities of national significance that will contribute to the development and implementation of high-quality professional development activities in the core academic subject areas;

"(2) support the development of challenging curriculum that is aligned with State or local content and performance standards; and

"(3) evaluate activities carried out under this subpart and under subpart 2.

"(b) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—In carrying out this program, the Secretary shall consult and coordinate with the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, and other appropriate Federal agencies and entities.

"SEC. 2112. AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.

"(a) The Secretary shall use funds available to carry out this subpart—

"(1) to provide seed money to eligible entities to develop their capacity to offer sustained and intensive high-quality professional development;

"(2) for the development and maintenance of a national clearinghouse for science, mathematics, and technology education materials which shall be administered as an adjunct clearinghouse of the ERIC system of clearinghouses supported by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement;

"(3) to support consortia of educational agencies and organizations in disseminating information and providing assistance regarding curricula, teaching methods, and assessment tools that support national or State content standards in mathematics and science; and

"(4) the evaluation of programs under this subpart and under subpart 2.

"(b) The Secretary may use funds available to carry out this subpart—

"(1) for the development and maintenance of national clearinghouses for core academic subjects as the Secretary determines are needed and which shall be administered as adjunct clearinghouses of the ERIC system of clearinghouses supported by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement;

"(2) to provide grants to entities to develop high quality curricula that are aligned with voluntary national or State content standards;

"(3) to sponsor institutes that provide teachers and administrators with professional development that is based on strong and integrated disciplinary content and pedagogical components;

"(4) for efforts to train teachers in the innovative uses and applications of technology to enhance student learning;

"(5) to encourage the development of local and national professional networks of educators;

"(6) to disseminate standards in the core academic subjects, including information on voluntary national content and performance standards and related models of high-quality professional development;

"(7) for efforts to train teachers in innovative uses of applied learning strategies such as service learning;

"(8) to disseminate models of high-quality professional development activities that train educators in strategies, techniques, methods, and practices for meeting the educational needs of historically underserved populations, including

females, minorities, individuals with disabilities, limited-English proficient individuals, and economically disadvantaged individuals, in order to ensure that all students have the opportunity to achieve challenging performance standards;

"(9) to promote the transferability of licensure and certification of teachers and administrators among State and local jurisdictions; and

"(10) to support the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

"(c) In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that each program, project, and activity contained in such subsection receives an allocation that is no less than the amount that each such program, project, or activity received in fiscal year 1994.

"Subpart 2—State and Local Activities

"SEC. 2121. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

"The Secretary is authorized to make grants to State educational agencies for the improvement of teaching and learning through sustained and intensive high-quality professional development activities in the core academic subjects at the State and local levels and the development by teachers and others of high-quality curricula that are aligned with State or local content and performance standards.

"SEC. 2122. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

"(a) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—From the amount made available to carry out this subpart for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall—

"(1) reserve one half of one percent for the outlying areas, to be distributed among them on the basis of relative need, as determined by the Secretary in light of the purposes of this part; and

"(2) reserve one half of one percent for the Secretary of the Interior for programs under this subpart for professional development activities for teachers, other staff, and administrators in schools operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

"(b) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—The Secretary shall allocate the remaining amount to each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as follows, except that no State shall receive less than one-half of one percent of such remaining amount:

"(1) 50 percent shall be allocated among such jurisdictions on the basis of their relative populations of individuals aged 5 through 17, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data.

"(2) 50 percent shall be allocated among such jurisdictions in accordance with the relative amounts such jurisdictions received under part A of title I of this Act for the preceding fiscal year.

"(c) REALLOCATION.—If any jurisdiction does not apply for its allotment under subsection (b) for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reallocate such amount to the remaining jurisdictions in accordance with such subsection.

"SEC. 2123. WITHIN-STATE ALLOCATIONS.

"(a) RESERVATIONS.—Of the amounts received by a State under this subpart for a fiscal year—

"(1) not more than 5 percent shall be used for the administrative costs of programs carried out by the State educational agency and the State agency for higher education;

"(2) not more than 5 percent may be used for State-level activities, as described in section 2125; and

"(3) of the remaining amount—

"(A) 87 percent shall be distributed to local educational agencies, to be used in accordance with section 2129, as follows:

"(i) 50 percent of such amount shall be distributed in accordance with the relative enrollments in public and private nonprofit schools within their boundaries.

"(ii) 50 percent of such amount shall be distributed in accordance with the relative amount

such agencies received under part A of title I of this Act for the preceding fiscal year; and

"(B) 13 percent shall be used for competitive grants to institutions of higher education as described in section 2129.

"(b) LIMITATION.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any local educational agency that receives an allocation of less than \$10,000 under subsection (a) shall, for the purpose of providing services under this subpart, form a consortium with at least 1 other local educational agency or institution of higher education receiving assistance under this section.

"(2) WAIVER.—The State educational agency shall waive the application of paragraph (1) in the case of any local educational agency that demonstrates that the amount of its allocation is sufficient to provide a program of sufficient size, scope, and quality to be effective. In granting waivers under the preceding sentence, the State educational agency shall—

"(A) give special consideration to local educational agencies serving rural areas; and

"(B) consider cash or in-kind contributions provided from State or local sources that may be combined with the local educational agency's allocation for the purpose of providing services under this part.

"SEC. 2124. STATE APPLICATIONS.

"(a) APPLICATIONS REQUIRED.—Each State educational agency that wishes to receive its allotment under this subpart for any fiscal year shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such form as the Secretary may require.

"(b) STATE PLAN TO IMPROVE TEACHING AND LEARNING.—(1) Each application under this section shall include a State plan that—

"(A) is integrated with the State's plan, either approved or being developed, under title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and satisfies the requirements of this section that are not already addressed by that State plan; or

"(B) if the State does not have an approved plan under title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and is not developing such a plan, is integrated with other State plans under this Act and satisfies the requirements of this section.

"(2) Each such plan shall also—

"(A) be developed in conjunction with the State agency for higher education, institutions of higher education, schools of education, and with the extensive participation of teachers and administrators and members of the public who are interested in improving education in the State and show the role of each in implementation;

"(B) be designed to give teachers and administrators in the State the knowledge and skills to provide all students the opportunity to meet challenging State performance standards;

"(C) include an assessment of State and local needs for professional development and for the development of curricula that are aligned with State or local content and performance standards;

"(D) include a description of how the plan has assessed the needs of local education agencies serving rural areas, and what actions are planned to meet those needs;

"(E) include a description of how the plan has maintained funding for professional development activities in mathematics and science education;

"(F) include a description of how the activities funded under this subpart will address the needs of teachers in schools receiving assistance under part A of title I of this Act;

"(G) a description of how programs in all core academic subjects, but especially in mathematics and science, will take into account the need for greater access to, and participation in, such dis-

ciplines by students from historically underrepresented groups, including females, minorities, individuals with limited-English proficiency, the economically disadvantaged, and the disabled, by incorporating pedagogical strategies and techniques which meet their educational need;

"(H) if the State's needs assessment under subsection (C) demonstrates a need for professional development, describe how the State will—

"(i) work with teachers, including teachers in schools receiving assistance under part A of title I of this Act, administrators, local educational agencies, schools, and institutions of higher education to ensure that they develop the capacity to support sustained and intensive, high-quality professional development programs in all the core academic subject areas, but especially in mathematics and science;

"(ii) take specific steps to review and, if necessary, reform State requirements for licensure of teachers and administrators, including certification and recertification, to align such requirements with challenging State content and performance standards; and

"(iii) address the need for improving teaching and learning through teacher development beginning with recruitment, pre-service, and induction, and continuing throughout the professional teaching career; and

"(I) if the State's needs assessment under subparagraph (C) demonstrates a need for curricula development, describe—

"(i) a strategy for engaging teachers in the development of curricula that are aligned with State or local content and performance standards; and

"(ii) how the State will also work with administrators, parents, school board members, and other members of the community in developing high quality curricula that are aligned with State or local content and performance standards.

"(c) ADDITIONAL MATERIAL.—Each State application shall also include—

"(1) a description of how the activities funded under this subpart will be coordinated, as appropriate, with—

"(A) other activities conducted with Federal funds, especially activities supported under part A of title I of this Act;

"(B) State and local funds;

"(C) resources from business and industry; and

"(D) funds from other Federal agencies, such as the National Science Foundation, the Departments of Commerce, Energy, and Health and Human Services, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities; and

"(2) a description of the activities to be sponsored under the State-level activities and the higher education components of its program under this subpart.

"(d) PEER REVIEW AND SECRETARIAL APPROVAL.—(1) The Secretary shall approve the application of a State educational agency if it meets the requirements of this section and holds reasonable promise of achieving the purposes of this part.

"(2) In reviewing applications, the Secretary shall obtain the advice of non-Federal experts on education in the core academic subjects and on teacher education, including teachers and administrators.

"(e) ASSURANCE.—Each State applying for funds under this title shall provide the Secretary with the assurance that after July 1, 1998, it will require each local educational agency within the State to certify that each full time teacher in schools under the jurisdiction of the agency is certified to teach in the subject area to which he or she is assigned. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent a State

from implementing alternative methods of teacher certification.

"SEC. 2125. STATE-LEVEL ACTIVITIES.

"Each State may use funds reserved under section 2123(a)(2) to carry out activities referred to in section 2124(b), such as—

"(1) reviewing and reforming State requirements for teacher and administrator licensure, including certification and recertification, to align such requirements with the State's content standards and ensure that teachers and administrators have the knowledge and skills necessary to help students meet challenging State performance standards;

"(2) developing performance assessments and peer review procedures, as well as other methods, for licensing teachers and administrators;

"(3) providing technical assistance to schools and local educational agencies especially schools and local educational agencies that receive assistance under part A of title I of this Act, to help such schools and agencies provide effective professional development in the core academic subjects and develop high quality curricula;

"(4) developing or supporting professional development networks, either within a State or in a regional consortium of States, that provide a forum for interaction among teachers and that allow exchange of information on advances in content assessment and pedagogy;

"(5) supporting partnerships between schools, consortia of schools, or local education agencies and institutions of higher education, including but not limited to schools of education, which would encourage teachers to participate in intensive, ongoing professional development programs, both academic and pedagogical, at institutions of higher education, and to encourage students at institutions of higher education studying to become teachers to have direct, practical experience at the schools;

"(6) enhancing the effective use of educational technology as an instructional tool for increasing student understanding of the core academic subject areas including—

"(A) efforts to train teachers in the innovative uses and application of instructional technology;

"(B) utilizing and strengthening existing telecommunications infrastructure dedicated to educational purposes; and

"(C) efforts to train teachers in methods for achieving gender equity both in access to and teaching practices used in the application of educational technology;

"(7) providing incentives for teachers to be involved in curriculum development and technical assistance processes for teachers and students;

"(8) professional development enabling teachers and other school staff to ensure that girls, young women, minorities, limited English proficient students, individuals with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged individuals have the opportunity to achieve challenging State performance standards in the core academic subjects by, for example, encouraging girls, young women, and minorities to pursue advanced courses in mathematics and science;

"(9) designing professional development activities that increase the numbers of members of minority and other underrepresented groups in the teaching force in the core subjects;

"(10) developing high quality curriculum that is aligned with State or local content and performance standards; and

"(11) providing financial or other incentives for teachers to become certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

"SEC. 2126. LOCAL PLAN AND APPLICATION FOR IMPROVING TEACHING AND LEARNING.

"(a) **LOCAL APPLICATION.**—(1) Each local educational agency that wishes to receive a

subgrant under this subpart shall submit an application (singly or as a consortia as described in section 2123(b)) to the State educational agency at such time as the State educational agency shall require, but not less frequently than every 3rd year.

"(2) If the local educational agency has an application approved by the State under title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the application required by this section shall be a component of (or, if necessary, an addendum to) its Goals 2000 application.

"(3) A local education agency shall set specific performance indicators for improving teaching and learning through professional development and curriculum development.

"(4) A local educational agency shall submit, as part of its application, the results of the needs assessment conducted under subsection (b), and the local educational agency plan developed in accordance with subsection (c).

"(b) **NEEDS ASSESSMENT.**—(1) A local educational agency that wishes to receive a subgrant under this subpart shall include in its application an assessment of such agency's need for professional development, for the development of high quality curricula that are aligned with State or local content and performance standards.

"(2) Such needs assessment shall be carried out with the involvement of teachers, including teachers in schools receiving assistance under part A of title I of this Act, and shall take into account what activities need to be conducted in order to give teachers and administrators the means, including the knowledge and skills, to provide students with the opportunity to meet challenging State or local performance standards.

"(c) **PLAN DEVELOPMENT.**—(1) The plan required under this subsection shall be developed jointly by the local educational agency and by teachers from the core academic disciplines.

"(2) Such teachers shall also be representative of the grade spans within schools to be served and of schools which receive assistance under part A of title I of this Act.

"(3) Based on the needs assessment required under subsection (b), the local educational agency's plan shall include the following—

"(A) a description of the local educational agency's strategy to improve teaching and learning in every school;

"(B) a description of how the plan contributes to the local educational agency's overall efforts for school reform and educational improvement;

"(C) a description of the activities the local educational agency intends to undertake under this subpart consistent with such agency's needs assessment conducted under subsection (b);

"(D) a description of how the plan has maintained funding for professional development activities in mathematics and science education;

"(E) a description of how the activities funded under this section will address the needs of teachers in schools receiving assistance under part A of title I of this Act;

"(F) a description of how programs in all core academic subjects, but especially in mathematics and science, will take into account the need for greater access to, and participation in, such disciplines by students from historically underrepresented groups, including females, minorities, individuals with limited-English proficiency, the economically disadvantaged, and the disabled, by incorporating pedagogical strategies and techniques which meet their educational need;

"(G) an assurance that the activities conducted with funds received under this program will be assessed at least every 3 years using the performance indicators; and

"(H) a description of how the program funded under this subpart will be coordinated, as appropriate, with—

"(i) activities conducted under section 2130 and other services of institutions of higher education;

"(ii) similar State and local activities;

"(iii) resources provided under part A of title I and other parts of this Act, particularly part B of title II;

"(iv) resources from business, industry, private nonprofit organizations (including museums, libraries, educational television stations, community-based organizations, professional organizations and associations specializing in, or with a demonstrated expertise in the core academic disciplines);

"(v) funds or programming from other Federal agencies, such as the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, the Department of Health and Human Services, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Endowment for the Arts; and

"(vi) an identification of funding that will provide the local educational agency's contribution under section 2127.

"SEC. 2127. LOCAL COST SHARING.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Each local educational agency shall bear not less than 33 percent of the cost of any program carried out under this subpart, but not including the cost of services provided to private schoolteachers.

"(b) **AVAILABLE RESOURCES FOR COST-SHARING.**—A local educational agency may meet the requirements of subsection (a) through one or more of the following:

"(1) Cash expenditures from non-Federal sources, including private contributions, directed toward professional development and curriculum development activities.

"(2) Release time for teachers participating in professional development or curricula development funded under this subpart.

"(3) Funds received under one or more of the following programs, if used for professional development or curricula development activities consistent with this subpart and consistent with the statutes under which such funds are provided, then such funds must be used for the benefit of students and teachers in the schools that would otherwise have been served with such funds:

"(A) Part A of title I of this Act.

"(B) The Safe and Drug Free Schools program under title IV of this Act.

"(C) The bilingual education program under title VII of this Act.

"(D) The Women's Educational Equity Program under title III of this Act.

"(E) Title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

"(F) Programs that are related to the purposes of this Act that are administered by other agencies, including the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Department of Energy.

"(c) **WAIVER.**—The State educational agency may approve an application which has not fully met the requirements of subsection (a) and waive the requirements of subsection (a) if a local educational agency can demonstrate that it is unable to meet the requirements of subsection (a) due to economic hardship and that compliance with such requirements would preclude its participation in the program.

"SEC. 2128. LOCAL ALLOCATION OF FUNDS AND ALLOWABLE ACTIVITIES.

"(a) **LOCAL ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.**—Each local educational agency that receives funds under this subpart for any fiscal year—

"(1) shall use not less than 80 percent of such funds for—

"(A) professional development of teachers, principals, and other instructional staff who work directly with children; and

"(B) engaging teachers and other staff in the development of high quality curricula aligned

with State and local content and performance standards, in a manner that is determined by such teachers and staff and is consistent with the provisions of such local educational agency's application under section 2126, any school plan under part A of title I of this Act, and any other plan for professional development or curricula development carried out with Federal, State, or local funds; and

"(2) may use not more than 20 percent of such funds for district-level professional or curricula development activities, which may include the participation of administrators and policymakers if such activities directly support instructional personnel.

"(b) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—Each local educational agency and school that receives funds under this subpart shall use such funds for activities that give teachers and administrators the knowledge and skills to provide students with the opportunity to meet challenging State or local content and performance standards. Funds received by local educational agencies under this subpart only shall be used for the activities specified under subsections (c) and (d). No less than 80 percent of those funds shall be used for activities under subsection (c) and not more than 20 percent for activities under subsection (d).

"(c) **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.**—If a needs assessment conducted under section 2126(b) determines that funds under this subpart should be used to provide professional development in the core academic subjects for teachers and other school staff, the local educational agency shall use such funds for professional development for teachers and other staff to support teaching consistent with State, or local content standards, and shall, to the extent practicable, coordinate such activities with institutions of higher education and activities under section 2129:

"(1) Professional development activities funded under this subpart shall—

"(A) be tied to challenging State or local content and student performance standards;

"(B) reflect recent research on teaching and learning;

"(C) incorporate effective strategies, techniques, methods, and practices for meeting the educational needs of diverse students, including females, minorities, individuals with disabilities, limited-English proficient individuals, and economically disadvantaged individuals, in order to ensure that all students have the opportunity to achieve challenging performance standards;

"(D) include strong academic content and pedagogical components;

"(E) be of sufficient intensity and duration to have a positive and lasting impact on the teacher's performance in the classroom; and

"(F) be part of the everyday life of the school and create an orientation toward continuous improvement throughout the school.

"(2) Funds under this subpart may be used for professional development activities such as—

"(A) professional development for teams of teachers, administrators, or other staff from individual schools, to support teaching consistent with State or local content standards;

"(B) support and time for teachers and other school staff to participate in professional development in the core subjects offered through professional associations, universities, community-based organizations, and other providers including museums and educational partnership organizations;

"(C) activities that provide followup for teachers who have participated in professional development activities that are designed to ensure that knowledge and skills learned by the teacher are implemented in the classroom;

"(D) support for partnerships between schools, consortia of schools, or local education

agencies and institutions of higher education, including but not limited to schools of education, which would encourage teachers to participate in intensive, ongoing professional development programs, both academic and pedagogical, at institutions of higher education, and to encourage students at institutions of higher education studying to become teachers to have direct, practical experience at the schools;

"(E) the establishment and maintenance of local professional networks that provide a forum for interaction among teachers and that allow exchange of information on advances in content and pedagogy;

"(F) activities to prepare teachers in the effective use of educational technology as an instructional tool for increasing student understanding of the core academic subject areas;

"(G) activities to enable teachers to ensure that girls, young women, minorities, limited-English proficient students, individuals with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged individuals the opportunity to achieve the challenging State performance standards in the core academic subjects;

"(H) professional development and recruitment activities designed to increase the number of minorities, individuals with disabilities, and females teaching in the core academic subject in which they are underrepresented;

"(I) the development of incentive strategies for rewarding schools where a substantial portion of the teachers achieve certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards; and

"(J) other sustained and intensive high-quality professional development activities in the core academic subjects.

"(d) **CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT.**—(1) If the needs assessment of a local educational agency determines that funds under this subpart should be used for curriculum development, such agency shall use the funds provided to develop high quality curricula that is aligned with State or local content and performance standards.

"(2) Funds may be used to purchase the curriculum materials to the extent such materials are essential components of the local educational agency's plan to improve teaching and learning in the core academic subjects.

"SEC. 2129. HIGHER EDUCATION ACTIVITIES.

"(a) **GENERAL.**—(1) The State agency for higher education, working in conjunction with the State educational agency (if it is a separate agency), shall make grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations including museums and educational partnership organizations, which demonstrate consultation and cooperation with a local education agency, consortium of local education agencies, or schools, for—

"(A) professional development activities in the core academic subject areas that contribute to the State plan for professional development;

"(B) engaging teachers in the development of high-quality curricula that are aligned with State or local content and performance standards;

"(C) developing and providing assistance to local education agencies, and the teachers and staff of each such agency, for sustained, high-quality professional development activities; and

"(D) improving teacher education programs in order to promote further innovation in teacher education programs within an institution of higher education and to better meet the needs of the local education agencies for well-prepared teachers;

"(2) All such awards shall be made on a competitive basis.

"(3) No institution of higher education may receive assistance under subsection (a)(1) of this subsection unless the institution enters into an

agreement with a local education agency, or consortium of such agencies, to provide sustained, high-quality professional development for the elementary and secondary school teachers in the schools of each such agency.

"(4) Each project funded under this section shall involve a joint effort of the recipient's school or department of education and the schools or departments in the specific disciplines in which assistance may be provided.

"(b) **ALLOWABLE ACTIVITIES.**—A recipient of funds under this section shall use those funds for—

"(1) sustained and intensive high-quality professional development for teams of teachers, or teachers and administrators from individual schools or districts;

"(2) other sustained and intensive professional development activities related to achievement of the State plan for professional development such as—

"(A) establishment and maintenance of professional networks of teachers that provide a forum for interaction among teachers and that allow exchange of information on advances in content and pedagogy;

"(B) programs that prepare teachers to be effective users of information technology, able to integrate technology into their pedagogy and their instructional practices, and able to enhance their curricular offerings by appropriate applications of technology;

"(C) programs that utilize information technology to deliver sustained and intensive high quality professional development activities for teachers;

"(D) activities to enable teachers to ensure that girls, young women, minorities, limited-English proficient students, individuals with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged individuals have the opportunity to achieve the challenging State performance standards in the core academic subjects;

"(E) professional development and recruitment activities designed to increase the number of minorities, individuals with disabilities, and other underrepresented groups teaching in the core academic subjects, particularly in mathematics and science;

"(F) establishment of professional development academies operated as partnerships between one or more elementary or secondary schools and one or more institutions of higher education to provide school-based teacher training that provides prospective, novice, and experienced teachers with an opportunity to work under the guidance of master teachers and college faculty members; and

"(G) technical assistance to local educational agencies in providing sustained and intensive high quality professional development activities for teachers.

"Subpart 3—General Provisions

"SEC. 2131. REPORTING AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

"(a) **STATES.**—Each State that receives funds under this part shall submit a report to the Secretary every 3 years on the State's progress toward the performance indicator identified in its State plan, as well as on the effectiveness of State and local activities under this part.

"(b) **LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.**—Each local educational agency that receives funds under this part shall submit a report to the State every 3 years on its progress toward the outcome performance indicators in its plan.

"(c) **FEDERAL EVALUATION.**—The Secretary shall report to the President and Congress on the effectiveness of programs and activities funded under this part.

"(d) **PROHIBITION ON FUNDS BEING USED FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RENOVATION.**—Funds received under this part shall not be used for construction or renovation of buildings, rooms, or any other facilities.

"SEC. 2132. DEFINITIONS.

"As used in this part, the following terms have the following meanings:

"(1) The term 'core academic subjects' means those subjects listed in the State plan under title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act or under National Education Goal Three as set out in section 102(3) of such Act.

"(2) The term 'performance indicators' means measures of specific outcomes that the State or local educational agency identifies as assessing progress toward the goal of ensuring that all teachers have the knowledge and skills to assist their students to meet challenging State standards in the core academic subject areas. Examples of such indicators include—

"(A) the degree to which licensure requirements are tied to State standards;

"(B) specific increases in the number of elementary and secondary teachers with strong content backgrounds in the core academic subjects;

"(C) incorporates effective strategies, techniques, methods, and practices for meeting the educational needs of diverse students, including females, minorities, individuals with disabilities, limited-English proficient individuals, and economically disadvantaged individuals, in order to ensure that all students have the opportunity to achieve challenging performance standards; and

"(D) specific increases in the number of Board certified teachers licensed in each core subject.

"(3) The term 'sustained and intensive high-quality professional development' means professional development activities that—

"(A) are tied to challenging State or voluntary national content and performance standards;

"(B) reflect up-to-date research in teaching and learning and include integrated content and pedagogical components;

"(C) incorporates effective strategies, techniques, methods, and practices for meeting the educational needs of diverse students, including females, minorities, individuals with disabilities, limited English proficient individuals, and economically disadvantaged individuals, in order to assure that all students have the opportunity to achieve challenging performance standards;

"(D) are of sufficient intensity and duration to have a positive and lasting impact on the teacher's performance in the classroom or the administrator's performance on the job; and

"(E) recognize teachers as an important source of knowledge that should inform and help shape professional development.

"(4) The term 'local standard' means challenging content and performance standards in the core subjects (in addition to State content and performance standards approved by the State for title I).

"PART B—TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION ASSISTANCE

"Subpart 1—Assistance to State and Local Educational Agencies

"SEC. 2201. SHORT TITLE.

"This title may be cited as the 'Technology Education Assistance Act of 1994'.

"SEC. 2202. FINDINGS.

"The Congress finds that—

"(1) technology can produce far greater opportunities for all students to learn to high standards and promote efficiency and effectiveness in education;

"(2) the use of technology as a tool in the teaching and learning process is essential to the development and maintenance of a technologically literate citizenry and an internationally competitive workforce;

"(3) the acquisition and use of technology in education throughout the United States has been inhibited by the absence of Federal leadership, the inability of many State and local edu-

cational agencies to invest in and support needed technologies, and the limited availability of appropriate technology-enhanced curriculum, instruction, teacher training, and administrative support resources and services in the educational marketplace;

"(4) educational equalization concerns and school restructuring needs can be addressed through educational telecommunications and technology by offering universal access to high-quality teaching and programs, particularly in urban and rural areas;

"(5) in the absence of appropriate educational technology policies, the disparity between rich and poor students will become even greater in a world where technology and telecommunications increasingly have become an integral part of many households;

"(6) the increasing use of new technologies and telecommunications systems in business and industry has furthered the gap between schooling and work force preparation;

"(7) telecommunications can be a conduit for ongoing teacher training and improved professional development by providing to teachers constant access to updated research in teaching and learning;

"(8) research consistently shows that the planned use of technology combined with teachers who are adequately trained in its use can increase opportunities for more students to develop higher order thinking and technical skills than is possible with traditional instruction;

"(9) technology can engage students in learning through media with which they are comfortable, and prove to be an effective learning tool, particularly when correlated with State and national curriculum standards;

"(10) schools need new ways of financing the acquisition and maintenance of educational technology; and

"(11) the needs for educational technology differ from State to State.

"SEC. 2203. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

"The purpose of this Act is to support a comprehensive system for the acquisition and use by elementary and secondary schools in the United States of technology and technology-enhanced curricula, instruction, and administrative support resources and services to improve the delivery of educational services, such system shall include—

"(1) national leadership with respect to the need for, and the provision of, appropriate technology-enhanced curriculum, instruction and administrative programs to improve learning in the United States;

"(2) funding mechanisms which will support the development, interconnection, implementation, improvement and maintenance of an effective educational technology infrastructure;

"(3) information dissemination networks to facilitate access to information on effective learning programs, assessment and evaluation of such programs, research findings, and supporting resources (including instructionally based, technology-enhanced programs, research and resources) by educators throughout the United States;

"(4) an extensive variety of opportunities for teacher, inservice training, and administrative training and technical assistance with respect to effective uses of technologies in education;

"(5) utilizing and strengthening, not duplicating, existing telecommunications infrastructures dedicated to educational purposes;

"(6) development and evaluation of new and emerging educational technologies and telecommunications networks;

"(7) assessment data regarding state-of-the-art uses of technologies in United States education upon which commercial and noncommercial telecommunications entities, and governments can rely on for decisionmaking about the

need for, and provision of, appropriate technologies for education in the United States; and

"(8) authorize grants to States that—

"(A) improve the academic performance of students through technology;

"(B) strengthen the skills of teachers in effectively utilizing technology for student learning;

"(C) promote the planned application of technology in education by those who will use the technology; and

"(D) encourage collaborative relationships between the State agency for higher education, the State library administrative agency and the State telecommunications agency for education and the State educational agency in the area of technology support to strengthen the system of education.

"SEC. 2204. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this title—

"(1) the terms 'library' and 'State library administrative agency' shall have the same meaning given to such terms in section 3 of the Library Services and Construction Act (Public Law 84-579);

"(2) the term 'Regional Education Laboratory' shall have the same meaning given to such term in section 405 of the Department of Education Organization Act (Public Law 96-88);

"(3) the term 'technology' includes closed circuit television systems, public telecommunications entities, cable television, satellite, copper and fiber optic transmission, computer, video and audio laser and CD ROM disc, video and audio tapes or other technologies;

"(4) the term 'credit enhancement' means a financial arrangement that enhances the credit quality of the issuer or the financial instrument being used; and

"(5) the term 'interoperability' means the ability to communicate with operating systems developed nationally and internationally using multiple network media.

"SEC. 2205. IN-STATE APPORTIONMENT.

"(a) AUTHORIZATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States in accordance with the provisions of this title to strengthen the skills of educators and improve learning through the use of technology.

"(b) ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—(1) For each fiscal year, an amount equal to 70 percent of each State's allotment under section 2212(a)(2) shall be used for elementary and secondary education programs by the State educational agency in accordance with section 2206.

"(2) Not less than 90 percent of a State's allotment under this subsection shall be available to local educational agencies including services to adults and families of which not more than 5 percent of the funds available to the local educational agency for any fiscal year may be used for local administration.

"(3) Not more than 10 percent of the amount allocated under subsection (a) may be used by the State educational agency for technical assistance and administrative costs of which not less than 50 percent shall be used for technical assistance.

"(c) HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—(1) For each fiscal year 20 percent of each State's allotment under section 2212(a)(2) shall be used by the State higher education agency designated in the State plan for partnership programs between local educational agencies, including educational services to adults and families and higher education institutions in accordance with section 2207.

"(2) Not less than 90 percent of the amount available for this subsection shall be used by the State for grants to institutions of higher education for partnership programs in accordance with the provisions of section 2207.

"(3) Not more than 10 percent of the amount allocated to the State's higher education part-

nership program under this section, may be used for the costs incurred for the evaluation of programs assisted under section 2207; and for administrative costs of the State's higher education agency designated in the State plan.

"(d) **LIBRARY AND LITERACY PROGRAMS.**—(1) For each fiscal year 10 percent of each State's allocation under section 2212(a)(2) shall be used by the State library administrative agency to support collaborative activities among libraries, literacy programs, and local educational agencies in accordance with section 2208.

"(2) Not less than 90 percent of the amount available for this section shall be used by the State for grants to local public libraries and literacy programs in accordance with the provisions of section 2208.

"(3) Not more than 10 percent of the amount available under this section may be used by the State for the costs incurred for evaluation of programs assisted under section 2208 and for administrative costs of the State library administrative agency.

"SEC. 2206. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount apportioned under section 2205(b) from each State's allotment shall be used by the State educational agency to strengthen elementary and secondary education programs in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) **LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.**—(1) Each local educational agency, including educational services for adults and families, shall use the educational technology funds available under section 2205(b)(2) for—

"(A) developing, adapting, or expanding existing and new applications of technology to support the school reform effort; and

"(B) funding projects of sufficient size and scope to improve student learning and, as appropriate, support professional development, and provide administrative support.

"(2) To be eligible to receive educational technology funds under this section for school or other school managed alternative learning environment, a local educational agency must submit an application to the State educational agency. If the local educational agency has an application approved by the State under title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the application required by this section shall be a component of (or if necessary an addendum to) its Goals 2000 application. The local educational agency must also receive State approval of a technology use plan which includes—

"(A) a description of how the local educational agency plans to use the financial assistance received under section 2205(b)(2) to improve the use of technology in instruction, professional development and administration;

"(B) a description of how funds under section 2205(b)(2) will be coordinated with other State, local and Federal resources;

"(C) a description of how the school programs will use other resources of the community and involve public agencies, private industry, institutions of higher education, public and private nonprofit organizations, and other appropriate institutions;

"(D) assurances that the programs will be evaluated and outcomes reported in terms of the level of implementation of the technology-based resources funded by this title, the impact on teaching and learning, the changes in the school program, and the extent to which the school will sustain the project after funding is terminated;

"(E) a description of how the plan will support State and local content and performance standards;

"(F) provisions to support, as needed, individual teachers to develop and implement technology-based intervention projects, including

those which respond to the needs of students with disabilities;

"(G) a description of how the financial assistance will be used as appropriate for the expansion and improvement of professional development of teachers and other appropriate personnel regarding the use of technology, including the educational use of computers, videos, and telecommunications to enhance learning such training and instruction may be carried out through agreements with public agencies, private industry, institutions of higher education, regional educational laboratories and national research centers, nonprofit organizations, (including museums) libraries, educational television stations;

"(H) a description of a strategy for the enhanced involvement of parents through the use of technology; and

"(I) a description of how the plan will address the needs of students with disabilities.

"(3) A local educational agency for any fiscal year may apply for financial assistance as part of a consortium with other local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, intermediate educational units, libraries, or other appropriate educational entities to provide local programs. The State educational agency may assist in the formation of consortia between local educational agencies, providers of educational services for adults and families, institutions of higher education, intermediate educational units, libraries, or other appropriate educational entities to provide services for the teachers and students in a local educational agency at the request of such local educational agency.

"SEC. 2207. HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount apportioned under section 2205(c) from each State's allotment shall be used by the State for education programs in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) **GRANTS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—(1) The State agency for higher education, in accordance with the State educational technology plan filed under section 2209, shall make grants available on a competitive basis to institutions of higher education in the State which form partnerships with one or more local educational agencies.

"(2) The amount available under section 2205(c)(2) shall be used for—

"(A) professional development for new teachers in the use of technology as an educational tool;

"(B) professional development for elementary, secondary, adult and family, and vocational school teachers and training for other appropriate school personnel to improve their ability to use educational technology in their teaching; and

"(C) programs to improve student performance in academic and work skill areas through the use of technology.

"(3) No institution of higher education may receive assistance under paragraph (2)(A), (B), and (C) unless the institution enters into an agreement with a local educational agency, or consortium of such agencies, to provide professional development for the elementary and secondary school teachers in the public and private schools of the school district of each agency.

"(c) **COOPERATIVE PROGRAM.**—The State higher education agency may use funds described in section 2205(c)(2) to achieve the objectives of section 2207 by establishing cooperative programs among institutions of higher education, private industry, and non-profit organizations, that include one or more local education agencies, for the development and dissemination of projects to improve student performance in academic or work skill areas.

"(d) **REPORTING.**—In accordance with section 2205(c), 5 percent of the funding available for

higher education partnerships may be used by the agency for higher education for evaluating the programs funded under this section. Reports on the progress of programs shall be provided to the State educational agency annually.

"SEC. 2208. LIBRARY AND LITERACY PROGRAMS.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amount apportioned under section 2205(d) from each State's allotment under this section shall be used by the State to assist literacy and education programs in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) **GRANTS TO LOCAL PUBLIC LIBRARIES.**—(1) In accordance with the State education technology plan filed under section 2209, the State library administrative agency shall make grants available on a competitive basis to local public libraries in the State which demonstrate involvement of one or more local educational agencies and literacy programs or organizations in their activities.

"(2) The amount available under section 2205(d)(2) shall be used for—

"(A) developing programs that help libraries, local educational agencies, and literacy programs use technology to share services and resources and develop collaborative activities that improve their performance and that of the students in academic and work skill areas; and

"(B) professional development for library, literacy, and other appropriate personnel to improve their skills in the use of educational technology and telecommunications.

"(c) **COOPERATIVE PROGRAM.**—The State library administration agency may use funds described in section 2205(d)(2) to achieve the objectives of section 2208 by establishing cooperative programs among public libraries, literacy organizations, private industries, and nonprofit education organizations, if such programs include one or more local educational agencies.

"(d) **REPORTING.**—In accordance with section 2205(d), funding available for library and literacy programs may be used by the library administrative agency for reporting and evaluating the programs funded under this section. Reports on the progress of programs shall be provided to the State educational agency annually.

"SEC. 2209. STATE EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY PLAN.

"(a) **APPLICATION.**—(1) Each State educational agency which desires to receive a grant under this title shall, in consultation with the State agency for higher education and the State library administrative agency, file a single educational technology plan with the Secretary of Education which covers a period of 5 fiscal years. The State educational agency shall be responsible for funding, supervising, and coordinating programs described under this title and shall file the educational technology plan at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such financial, educational and technological information as this section requires or as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"(2) Such plan shall be—

"(A) integrated with the State's plan either approved or being developed under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and shall satisfy the requirements of this section that are not already addressed by that State plan; or

"(B) if the State does not have an approved plan under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and is not developing such a plan, integrated with other State plans under this Act and satisfy the requirements of this section.

"(b) **CONTENTS OF THE PLAN.**—Each such plan shall—

"(1) designate the State agency or agencies responsible for administering the elementary and secondary adult and family programs under section 2206, and the higher education programs under section 2207 and designate the State li-

brary administrative agency to administer the library and literacy programs under section 2208 in support of improved student learning;

"(2) describe a financial plan developed by the State educational agency, which shall describe—

"(A) financial assistance mechanisms to best fit the technology needs of the State. Such mechanisms, which must be included in the plan, may include, but not be limited to—

"(i) grants;

"(ii) matching grants;

"(iii) loans;

"(iv) loan guarantees; and

"(v) other credit enhancements.

"(B) describe criteria and approving procedures for submitting applications for programs described in sections 2206, 2207, and 2208 for funding assistance under section 2205 within the State;

"(C) delineate processes for auditing and monitoring the use of funds by recipients;

"(D) describe priorities for awarding funds under various funding mechanisms; and

"(E) construe nothing in subsection (b)(2) to implicitly or explicitly imply that the funds made available under this subsection, through whatever mechanism is chosen by the State agency, and recommended for approval to the Secretary are backed by the full faith and credit of the Federal Government;

"(3) designate the State education agency or another single agency to carry out the financial plan developed by the State education agency and to allocate funds received under sections 2205 and 2212(a)(2). Such designated agency shall be responsible for—

"(A) maintaining appropriate records of allocation of funds, and, in the case of loans, adequate collection procedures and records;

"(B) reporting annually to the Secretary on the use of funds received under section 2212(a)(2);

"(4) describe an implementation strategy to coordinate the expenditure of financial assistance paid under sections 2205 and 2212(a)(2) with other State and local funds, other Federal funds and resources;

"(5) provide assurances that financial assistance provided under section 2205 shall supplement, not supplant, State and local funds;

"(6) describe how business, industry, and other public and private agencies, including libraries, literacy programs, and institutions of higher education, can participate in the implementation, ongoing planning, and support of the plan;

"(7) delineate educational problems and needs in the State, describe all learning environments supported by the State plan, and specify how the application of technology will address those and other needs including but not limited to the special needs of—

"(A) urban and rural schools;

"(B) students with disabilities; and

"(C) disadvantaged students;

"(8) provide assurances that—

"(A) during the 5-year period of the plan, the State shall evaluate its standards for teacher preparation in the use of technology; and

"(B) programs conducted with State funds available under this title shall be evaluated and an evaluation report shall be submitted to the Secretary at the close of the third year of funding;

"(9) describe how the State educational agency will promote the purchase of equipment by local school districts and schools that, when placed in operation, will provide the greatest accessibility and equity for students and meet the highest level of interoperability and open system design within the emerging broad-based electronic information highway that includes schools within the State;

"(10) describe the State's strategy for ensuring that teachers, administrators and other education personnel have access to the necessary staff development and technical assistance to improve teaching and learning, school administration, and the electronic transfer of, and access to, information;

"(11) establish a method for continuously gathering and disseminating current and emerging information on all aspects of educational technology to all educators within the State;

"(12) describe how the State's planned use of technology is supportive of the national education goals;

"(13) provide performance indicators and an evaluation method for the State plan; and

"(14) create a planning process through which such plan is reviewed and updated periodically.

"(c) APPROVAL OF PLANS.—(1) The State educational agency shall submit a plan for approval to the Secretary who shall expeditiously review such State plan.

"(2) Any State that submits a plan that is not approved shall receive assistance from the Secretary to improve its plan.

"SEC. 2210. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY PLAN.

"(a) APPLICATION.—A local educational agency that desires to receive financial assistance under section 2205, shall submit to the State educational agency (singly or in conjunction with other local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, or an intermediate educational unit) a plan which covers a 3-year period.

"(b) CONTENTS OF THE PLAN.—A local educational agency plan shall—

"(1) assure that the programs will be evaluated, and outcomes reported in terms of—

"(A) the level of implementation of the technology-based resources funded by this title;

"(B) the impact on teaching and learning; and

"(C) the extent to which the school or other appropriate learning environments will sustain the project after funding is terminated;

"(2) be consistent with district level planning for educational technology, and shall support the local and State's curriculum frameworks;

"(3) make provision for technical support and professional development as needed for individual teachers to develop and implement technology-assisted instruction; and

"(4) provide a strategy for the enhanced involvement of parents through the use of technology.

"SEC. 2211. FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION.

"(a) EVALUATION PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall, with State and local representatives, develop procedures for State and local evaluations of the programs under this title.

"(b) EVALUATION SUMMARY.—The Secretary shall submit to the Congress 4 years after the enactment of this bill a summary of the State evaluations of programs under this subpart.

"SEC. 2212. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) From the amount appropriated under section 2213 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve—

"(A) not more than one half of one percent for allocation among Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this subpart; and

"(B) one half of 1 percent for programs for Indian students served by schools funded by the Secretary of the Interior consistent with the purposes of this subpart;

"(2) The remainder of the amount so appropriated after meeting the requirements of paragraph (1) shall be allocated among the States (for purposes of this section, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico shall be considered as

States) with approved State plans under section 2209 as follows—

"(A) $\frac{1}{2}$ of such remainder shall be allocated among the States by allocating to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such $\frac{1}{2}$ of such remainder as the number of children aged 5 to 17, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all States;

"(B) $\frac{1}{2}$ of such remainder shall be allocated among the States according to each State's share of allocations under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, except that no State shall receive less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent of the amount available under this subsection in any fiscal year or less than the amount allotted to such State for fiscal year 1988 under title II of the Education for Economic Security Act;

"(C) for the purposes of this subsection, the term "State" does not include Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and

"(D) the number of children aged 5 to 17, inclusive, in the State and in all States shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to the Secretary.

"(3) The Secretary shall make payments under paragraphs (1)(A) and (1)(B) on whatever terms the Secretary determines will best carry out the purposes of title I of this Act.

"(b) REALLOTMENT OF UNUSED FUNDS.—(1) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Secretary determines will not be required for such fiscal year to carry out part B of title II shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Secretary may determine, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Secretary estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year.

"(2) The total of reductions under paragraph (1) shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amounts reallocated to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed a subpart of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

"SEC. 2213. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"There are authorized to be appropriated \$300,000,000 for this subpart for 1995 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1999.

"Subpart 2—Research, Development, and Demonstration of Educational Technology

"SEC. 2214. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

"(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

"(1) technology has the potential to assist and support the improvement of teaching and learning in schools and other settings;

"(2) technology can provide students, parents, teachers, and other education professionals with increased access to information, instruction, and educational services in schools and other settings, including homes, libraries, preschool and child-care facilities, and postsecondary institutions;

"(3) technology can produce far greater opportunities for all students to learn to high standards and to promote efficiency and effectiveness in education; and

"(4) the rapidly changing nature of technology requires coordination and flexibility in Federal leadership.

"(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this subpart are to promote achievement of the National Education Goals and to increase the opportunity for all students to achieve to challenging State standards by—

"(1) promoting awareness of the potential of technology for improving teaching and learning;

"(2) supporting State and local efforts to increase the effective use of technology for education;

"(3) demonstrating ways in which technology can be used to improve teaching and learning, and to help ensure that all students have an equal opportunity to meet challenging State education standards;

"(4) ensuring the availability of knowledge drawn from research and experience that can form the basis for sound State and local decisions about investment in, and effective uses of, educational technology;

"(5) promoting high-quality professional development opportunities for teachers and administrators on the integration of technology into instruction and administration;

"(6) ensuring that Federal technology-related policies and programs facilitate the use of technology in education; and

"(7) ensuring that, as technological advances are made, the educational uses of these advances are considered and their applications are developed.

"SEC. 2215. OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY.

"There is established in the Department an Office of Educational Technology, which shall be administered by a Director of Educational Technology appointed by the Secretary. The Office of Educational Technology, in consultation with other appropriate agencies, shall provide leadership to the Nation in the use of technology to promote achievement of the National Education Goals and to increase opportunities for all students to achieve to challenging State standards, and shall perform such additional functions as the Secretary may require.

"SEC. 2216. NATIONAL LONG-RANGE PLAN.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary shall develop and publish by September 30, 1995, and update when appropriate, a national long-range plan to carry out the purposes of this subpart.

"(2) The Secretary shall—

"(A) develop the plan in consultation with other Federal agencies, State and local education practitioners and policy-makers, experts in technology and the educational applications of technology, and providers of technology services and products;

"(B) transmit the plan to the President and to the appropriate committees of the Congress; and

"(C) publish the plan in a form that is readily accessible to the public.

"(b) CONTENTS OF THE PLAN.—The national long-range plan shall describe the Secretary's activities to promote the purposes of this subpart, including—

"(1) how the Secretary will encourage the effective use of technology to provide all students the opportunity to achieve to challenging State standards, especially through programs administered by the Department;

"(2) joint activities with other Federal agencies, such as the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and the Departments of Commerce, Energy, Health and Human Services, and Labor, to promote the use of technology in education, and training and lifelong learning, including plans for the educational uses of a national information infrastructure, and to ensure that the policies and programs of such agencies facilitate the use of technology for educational purposes to the extent feasible;

"(3) how the Secretary will work with educators, State and local educational agencies, and appropriate representatives of the private sector to facilitate the effective use of technology in education;

"(4) how the Secretary will promote—

"(A) increased access to the benefits of technology for teaching and learning for schools with high concentrations of children from low-income families;

"(B) the use of technology to assist in the implementation of State systemic reform strategies;

"(C) the application of technological advances to use in education; and

"(D) increased opportunities for the professional development of teachers in the use of new technologies;

"(5) how the Secretary will determine, in consultation with appropriate individuals, organizations, and agencies, the feasibility and desirability of establishing guidelines and protocols to facilitate effective use of technology in education; and

"(6) the Secretary's long-range measurable goals and objectives relating to the purposes of this subpart.

"SEC. 2217. FEDERAL LEADERSHIP.

"(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—(1) In order to provide Federal leadership in promoting the use of technology in education, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Science Foundation, the Department of Commerce, and other appropriate Federal agencies, may carry out activities designed to achieve the purposes of this subpart directly or by awarding grants (pursuant to a peer review process) to, or entering into contracts with, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, or other public and private nonprofit or for-profit agencies and organizations.

"(2) For the purpose of carrying out coordinated or joint activities consistent with the purposes of this subpart, the Secretary may accept funds from, and transfer funds to, other Federal agencies.

"(b) USES OF FUNDS.—The Secretary may use funds appropriated under this subpart for activities designed to carry out the purpose of this subpart, and to meet the goals and objectives of the national long-range plan under section 2216, including—

"(1) planning grants to States and local education agencies, to enable such entities to examine and develop strategies for the effective use of technology to help achieve the objectives of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1993;

"(2) development grants to technical assistance providers, to enable them to improve substantially the services they offer to educators on the educational uses of technology, including professional development;

"(3) consulting with representatives of industry, elementary and secondary education, higher education, and appropriate experts in technology and its educational applications in carrying out activities under this subpart;

"(4) research on, and the development of, guidelines and protocols to facilitate efficient and effective use of technology in education;

"(5) research on, and the development of, educational applications of the most advanced and newly emerging technologies;

"(6) the development, demonstration, and evaluation of applications of existing technology in preschool education, elementary and secondary education, training and lifelong learning, and professional development of educational personnel;

"(7) the development and evaluation of software and other products, including television programming, that incorporate advances in technology and help achieve the National Education Goals and challenging State standards;

"(8) the development, demonstration, and evaluation of model strategies for preparing teachers and other personnel to use technology effectively to improve teaching and learning;

"(9) the development of model programs to demonstrate the educational effectiveness of

technology in urban and rural areas and economically-distressed communities;

"(10) research on, and the evaluation of, the effectiveness and benefits of technology in education;

"(11) conferences on, and dissemination of information about, the uses of technology in education;

"(12) the development of model strategies to promote gender equity concerning access to, and the use of, technology in the classroom; and

"(13) such other activities as the Secretary determines would meet the purposes of this subpart.

"(c) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary is authorized to require any recipient of a grant or contract under this subpart to share in the cost of its project, which share shall be announced through a notice in the Federal Register and may be in the form of cash or in-kind contributions, fairly valued.

"(2) The Secretary may increase the non-Federal share required of such recipient after the first year of the recipient's project, except that such share may not exceed 50 percent at any time during the recipient's project.

"SEC. 2218. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"For the purpose of carrying out this subpart, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1999.

"Subpart 3—Star Schools Program

"SEC. 2219. FINDINGS.

"SEC. 3121. The Congress finds that—

"(1) the Star Schools program has helped to encourage the use of distance learning strategies to serve multi-State regions primarily by means of satellite and broadcast television;

"(2) in general, distance learning programs have been used effectively to provide students in small, rural, and isolated schools with courses and instruction, such as science and foreign language instruction, that the local educational agency would not otherwise have been able to provide; and

"(3) distance learning programs could also be used to—

"(A) provide students in all types of schools and local educational agencies with greater access to high-quality instruction in the full range of core academic subjects that would enable them to meet challenging, internationally competitive, educational standards;

"(B) expand professional development opportunities for teachers;

"(C) contribute to achievement of the National Education Goals; and

"(D) expand learning opportunities for everyone.

"SEC. 2220. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

"The purpose of this subpart is to encourage the expansion and use of distance learning programs and technologies to help—

"(1) improve teaching and learning;

"(2) achieve the National Education Goals;

"(3) all students learn to challenging State content standards; and

"(4) increase participation in State and local educational reform.

"SEC. 2221. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

"(a) STAR SCHOOL AWARDS.—The Secretary is authorized, in accordance with this subpart, to make grants to eligible entities for the Federal share of the cost of providing distance learning programs, including—

"(1) developing, constructing, and acquiring telecommunications facilities and equipment;

"(2) developing and acquiring instructional programming; and

"(3) providing technical assistance regarding the use of such facilities and instructional programming.

"(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—For the purpose of carrying out this subpart, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1999.

"(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—(1) A grant under this section shall not exceed—

"(A) five years in duration; and

"(B) \$10,000,000 in any one fiscal year.

"(2) Not less than 25 percent of the funds available to the Secretary for any fiscal year under this subpart shall be used for the cost of instructional programming.

"(3) Not less than 50 percent of the funds available to the Secretary for any fiscal year under this subpart shall be used for the cost of facilities, equipment, teacher training or retraining, technical assistance, or programming, for local educational agencies that are eligible to receive assistance under part A of title I of this Act.

"(d) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—(1) The Federal share of the cost of projects funded under this section shall not exceed 75 percent for the first and second years of the award, 60 percent for the third and fourth years, and 50 percent for the fifth year.

"(2) The Secretary may reduce or waive the requirement of the non-Federal share under paragraph (1) upon a showing of financial hardship.

"(e) **AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT FUNDS FROM OTHER AGENCIES.**—The Secretary is authorized to accept funds from other agencies to carry out the purposes of this section, including funds for the purchase of equipment.

"SEC. 2222. ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.

"(a) **ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.**—(1) The Secretary may make a grant under section 2221 to any eligible entity, provided that at least one local educational agency is participating in the proposed project.

"(2) An eligible entity may include—

"(A) a public agency or corporation established for the purpose of developing and operating telecommunications networks to enhance educational opportunities provided by educational institutions, teacher training centers, and other entities, except that any such agency or corporation shall represent the interests of elementary and secondary schools that are eligible to participate in the program under part A of title I of this Act; or

"(B) any two or more of the following, which will provide a telecommunications network:

"(i) a local educational agency that has a significant number of elementary and secondary schools that are eligible for assistance under part A of title I of this Act, or elementary and secondary schools operated or funded for Indian children by the Department of the Interior eligible under section 1121(b)(1) of this Act;

"(ii) a State educational agency;

"(iii) an institution of higher education or a State higher education agency;

"(iv) a teacher training center or academy that—

"(I) provides teacher pre-service and in-service training; and

"(II) receives Federal financial assistance or has been approved by a State agency;

"(v) (I) a public or private entity with experience and expertise in the planning and operation of a telecommunications network, including entities involved in telecommunications through satellite, cable, telephone, or computer; or

"(II) a public broadcasting entity with such experience; or

"(vi) a public or private elementary or secondary school.

"SEC. 2223. APPLICATIONS.

"(a) **GENERAL REQUIREMENT.**—Each eligible entity that desires to receive a grant under this

subpart shall submit an application to the Secretary in such form, at such time, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

"(b) **STAR SCHOOL AWARD APPLICATIONS.**—Each application for a grant authorized under section 2221 shall—

"(1) describe—

"(A) how the proposed project will assist in achieving the National Education Goals set out in title I of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, how it will assist all students to have an opportunity to learn to challenging State standards, and how it will assist State and local educational reform efforts;

"(B) the telecommunications facilities and equipment and technical assistance for which assistance is sought, which may include—

"(i) the design, development, construction, and acquisition of district, multidistrict, State, or multistate educational telecommunications networks and technology resource centers;

"(ii) microwave, fiber optics, cable, and satellite transmission equipment, or any combination thereof;

"(iii) reception facilities, satellite time, production facilities, and other telecommunications equipment capable of serving the intended geographic area;

"(iv) the provision of training services to instructors who will be using the facilities and equipment for which assistance is sought in using such facilities and equipment, and in integrating programs into the class curriculum; and

"(v) the development of educational and related programming for use on a telecommunications network;

"(C) the types of programming that will be developed to enhance instruction and training, including an assurance that such programming will be designed in consultation with professionals who are experts in the applicable subject matter and grade level;

"(D) how the eligible entity has engaged in sufficient survey and analysis of the area to be served to ensure that the services offered by the eligible entity will increase the availability of courses of instruction in English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, arts, history, geography, or other disciplines;

"(E) the professional development policies for teachers and other school personnel to be implemented to ensure the effective use of the telecommunications facilities and equipment for which assistance is sought;

"(F) the manner in which historically underserved students (such as students from low-income families, limited English proficient students, disabled students, or students who have low literacy skills) and their families will participate in the benefits of the telecommunications facilities, equipment, technical assistance, and programming assisted under this subpart;

"(G) how existing telecommunications equipment, facilities, and services, where available, will be used;

"(H) the activities or services for which assistance is sought, such as—

"(i) providing facilities, equipment, training services, and technical assistance;

"(ii) making programs accessible to individuals with disabilities through mechanisms such as closed captioning and descriptive video services;

"(iii) linking networks around issues of national importance (such as elections) or to provide information about employment opportunities, job training, or student and other social service programs;

"(iv) sharing curriculum materials between networks;

"(v) providing teacher and student support services;

"(vi) incorporating community resources such as libraries and museums into instructional programs;

"(vii) providing professional development for teachers, including, as appropriate, training to early childhood development and Head Start teachers and staff and vocational education teachers and staff; and

"(viii) providing programs for adults at times other than the regular school day in order to maximize the use of telecommunications facilities and equipment; and

"(1) how the proposed project as a whole will be financed and how arrangements for future financing will be developed before the project expires;

"(2) provide an assurance that a significant portion of any facilities, equipment, technical assistance, and programming for which assistance is sought for elementary and secondary schools will be made available to schools in local educational agencies that have a high percentage of children counted for the purpose of part A of title I of this Act; and

"(3) provide an assurance that the applicant will provide such information and cooperate in any evaluation that the Secretary may conduct under this subpart.

"(c) **PRIORITIES.**—The Secretary shall, in approving applications for grants authorized under section 2221, give priority to applications that—

"(1) propose high-quality plans to assist in achieving one or more of the National Education Goals as set out in title I of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, would provide instruction consistent with State content standards, or would otherwise provide significant and specific assistance to States and local educational agencies undertaking systemic education reform under title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act; and

"(2) would serve schools with significant numbers of children counted for the purposes of part A of title I of this Act.

"(d) **GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.**—In approving applications for grants authorized under section 2221, the Secretary shall, to the extent feasible, ensure an equitable geographic distribution of services.

"SEC. 2224. LEADERSHIP AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES.

"(a) **SET-ASIDE.**—From amounts appropriated under section 2221(b), the Secretary may reserve up to 10 percent for national leadership, evaluation, and peer review activities.

"(b) **METHOD OF FUNDING.**—The Secretary may fund the activities described in subsection (a) directly or through grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements.

"(c) **USES OF FUNDS.**—(1) Funds reserved for leadership activities may be used for—

"(A) disseminating information, including lists and descriptions of services available from recipients; and

"(B) other activities designed to enhance the quality of distance learning activities nationwide.

"(2) Funds reserved for evaluation activities shall be used to conduct independent evaluations of the Star Schools program under this subpart and of distance learning in general, including—

"(A) analyses of distance learning efforts, including both Star Schools projects and efforts not funded by the program under this subpart; and

"(B) comparisons of the effects, including student outcomes, of different technologies in distance learning efforts.

"(3) Funds reserved for peer review activities may be used for peer review of both proposals and funded projects.

"SEC. 2225. DEFINITIONS.

"For the purpose of this subpart, the following terms have the following meanings:

"(1) The term 'educational institution' means an institution of higher education, a local educational agency, or a State educational agency.

"(2) The term 'instructional programming' means courses of instruction and training courses for elementary and secondary students, teachers, and others, and materials for use in such instruction and training that have been prepared in audio and visual form on tape, disc, film, or live, and presented by means of telecommunications devices.

"(3) The term 'public broadcasting entity' has the same meaning given that term in section 397 of the Communications Act of 1934.

"Subpart 4—Development of Educational Technology Products

"SEC. 2226. EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT.

"(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to support the development of curriculum-based learning resources and systems using state-of-the-art technologies and techniques designed to improve student learning.

"(b) FEDERAL ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide assistance, on a competitive basis, to eligible consortia to enable such entities to develop, produce, and distribute state-of-the-art technology-enhanced instructional resources and programming for use in the classroom or to support professional development for teachers.

"(2) GRANTS AND LOANS AUTHORIZED.—In carrying out the purposes of this section, the Secretary is authorized to pay the Federal share of the cost of the development, production, and distribution of state-of-the-art technology enhanced instructional resources and programming—

"(A) by awarding grants to, or entering into contracts or cooperative agreements with eligible consortia; or

"(B) by awarding loans to eligible consortia which—

"(i) shall be secured in such manner and be repaid within such period, not exceeding 20 years, as may be determined by the Secretary;

"(ii) shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary which shall be not more than the total of one-quarter of 1 percent per annum added to the rate of interest paid by the Secretary on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury;

"(iii) may be forgiven by the Secretary, in an amount not to exceed 25 percent of the total loan, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may consider appropriate.

"(3) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Secretary shall require any recipient of a grant, contract, or loan under this section to share in the cost of the activities supported with such assistance.

"(4) ELIGIBLE CONSORTIUM.—For the purpose of this section, the term 'eligible consortium' means a consortium consisting of—

"(A) State or local educational agencies in partnership with business, industry, or telecommunications entity;

"(B) a business, industry, or telecommunications entity;

"(C) a public or private nonprofit organization; or

"(D) an institution of higher education.

"(5) PRIVATE SECTOR ADVISORY BOARD.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory board which shall provide advice and counsel to the Secretary concerning the most effective means of implementing the provisions of this section. Such board shall—

"(A) include educators, school administrators, and policymakers knowledgeable about the technology and curriculum needs of State and local education agencies;

"(B) include representatives of private profit and nonprofit entities engaged in the production and development of educational soft-

ware and other technology-based learning resources;

"(C) make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the types and terms of Federal financial assistance which promise to be most effective in advancing the purposes of this section;

"(D) regularly evaluate the implementation of this section.

"(6) PRIORITIES.—In awarding assistance under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to applications describing programs or systems that—

"(A) promote the acquisition of higher-order thinking skills and promise to raise the achievement levels of all students, particularly disadvantaged students who are not realizing their potential;

"(B) are aligned with challenging content standards and State and local curriculum frameworks;

"(C) may be adapted and applied nationally at a reasonable cost;

"(D) convert technology resources developed with support from the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies for effective use in the classroom;

"(E) promise to reduce the costs of providing high-quality instruction;

"(F) promise to expand access to high-quality instruction in content areas which would otherwise not be available to students in rural and urban communities or who attend other educational agencies with limited financial resources.

"(7) REQUIREMENTS FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.—Each eligible consortium desiring Federal assistance under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe. Each application shall include—

"(A) a description of how the program or system shall improve the achievement levels of students;

"(B) a description of how teachers associated with the program will be trained to integrate technology in the classroom;

"(C) a description of how the design, development, piloting, field testing, and distribution of the program or system will be carried out;

"(D) an assurance that the program or system shall effectively serve a large number or percentage of economically disadvantaged students;

"(E) plans for dissemination to a wide audience of learners; and

"(F) provisions for closed captioning or descriptive video where appropriate.

"(c) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall provide for the independent evaluation of programs or systems developed with assistance under this section and shall regularly collect and disseminate to State and local educational agencies and to the public information about the usefulness and effectiveness of such programs or systems.

"(d) ROYALTIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is authorized to require that a portion of any royalty paid as a result of assistance provided under this section be deposited in a central fund for the purposes of—

"(1) recovering all or part of the Federal share of the costs of developing, producing, and distributing the product for which such royalty is paid; and

"(2) carrying out the provisions of this section.

"(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999.

"PART C—LIBRARY MEDIA PROGRAM

"SEC. 2231. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.

"The Secretary shall award grants from allocations under section 2232 to States for the acquisition of school library media resources for the use of students, library media specialists, and teachers in elementary and secondary schools.

"SEC. 2232. ALLOCATION TO STATES.

"From the amount appropriated pursuant to section 2205 in each fiscal year, the Secretary shall allocate to each State having an approved plan under section 2233 as follows:

"(1) For appropriations below \$50,000,000, at the discretion of the Secretary, taking into account such factors as the age and condition of the State's existing library media collections.

"(2) For appropriations of \$50,000,000 and above to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such funds as the amount such State received under section 1122 of title I bears to the amount all States received under section 1122 in such year; except that no State shall receive less than one-half of one percent of such funds.

"SEC. 2233. STATE PLANS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In order for a State to receive an allocation of funds under section 2232 for any fiscal year, such State shall have in effect for such fiscal year a State plan. Such plan shall—

"(1) designate the State educational agency as the State agency responsible for the administration of the program described in this part;

"(2) set forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allocation under section 2202 will be expended solely for—

"(A) acquisition of school library media resources, including foreign language resources, for the use of students, school library media specialists, and teachers in elementary and secondary schools in the United States; and

"(B) administration of the State plan, including development and revision of standards, relating to school library media resources; except that the amount used for administration of the State plan in any fiscal year shall not exceed 5 percent of the amount allocated to such State under section 2232 for such fiscal year; and

"(3) set forth the criteria to be used in allotting funds for school library media resources among the local educational agencies of the State, which allotment shall take into consideration the relative need of the students, school media specialists, and teachers to be served.

"(b) PLAN SUBMISSION.—The State plan may be submitted as part of a consolidated application under section 9302.

"SEC. 2234. DISTRIBUTION OF ALLOCATION TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

"From the funds allocated to a State under section 2202 in each fiscal year, such State shall distribute not less than 99 percent of such funds in such year to local educational agencies within such State according to the relative enrollment of students in elementary and secondary schools within the school districts of such State, adjusted to provide higher per-pupil allotments to local educational agencies that have the greatest number or percentages of students whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child, such as those students—

"(1) living in areas with high concentrations of low-income families;

"(2) from low-income families; and

"(3) living in sparsely populated areas.

"SEC. 2235. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999.

"PART D—SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE FOR ESEA PROGRAMS"**"SEC. 2341. FINDINGS."**

"The Congress finds that—

"(1) high-quality technical assistance can enhance the improvements in teaching and learning achieved through the implementation of programs under this Act;

"(2) comprehensive technical assistance and effective program dissemination are essential ingredients of the overall strategy of the reauthorization of this Act to improve programs and to provide all children opportunities to meet challenging State performance standards;

"(3) States, local educational agencies, tribes, and schools serving students with special needs, such as students with limited English proficiency, have great need for comprehensive technical assistance in order to use funds under this Act to provide such students with opportunities to learn to challenging State standards;

"(4) current technical assistance and dissemination efforts are fragmented and categorical in nature, and thus fail to address adequately the needs of States and local educational agencies and tribes for help in integrating into a coherent strategy for improving teaching and learning the various programs under this Act with State and local programs and other education reform efforts;

"(5) too little creative use is made of technology as a means of providing information and assistance in a cost-effective way;

"(6) comprehensive technical assistance can help schools and school systems focus on improving opportunities for all children to reach challenging State performance standards, as they implement programs under this Act;

"(7) comprehensive technical assistance would provide coordinated assistance to help States, local educational agencies, tribes, participating colleges and universities, and schools integrate Federal, State, and local education programs in ways that contribute to improving schools and entire school systems;

"(8) technical assistance in support of programs under this Act should be coordinated with the Department's regional offices, the regional educational laboratories, State Literacy Resource Centers, vocational resource centers, and other technical assistance efforts supported by the Department;

"(9) technical assistance providers should prioritize assistance to local educational agencies and schools; and

"(10) technical assistance should both encourage the integration of categorical programs and ensure that students with special needs, such as limited English proficiency students, are served fully.

"SEC. 2342. PURPOSE."

"The purpose of this part is to create a national technical assistance and dissemination system to make available to States, local educational agencies, tribes, schools, and other recipients of funds under this Act technical assistance in—

"(1) implementing programs authorized by this Act in a manner that improves teaching and learning for all students;

"(2) coordinating those programs with other Federal, State, and local education plans and activities, so that all students are provided opportunities to meet challenging State performance standards, in particular students at risk of educational failure; and

"(3) adopting, adapting, and implementing promising and proven practices for improving teaching and learning.

"SEC. 2343. PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED."

"(a) **COMPREHENSIVE ASSISTANCE CENTERS.**—The Secretary is authorized to award grants or enter into contracts with public or private nonprofit entities or consortia to establish a

networked system of 15 centers to provide comprehensive research-based training and technical assistance to States, local educational agencies, schools, tribes, community-based organizations, and other recipients of funds under this Act in their administration and implementation of programs authorized by this Act. In establishing centers and allocating resources among the centers, the Secretary shall consider the geographic distribution of title I students; the geographic and linguistic distribution of students of limited English proficiency; the geographic distribution of Indian students; the special needs of students living in rural areas; and the special needs of States and territories in geographic isolation.

"(b) **STATE-BASED ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary is authorized to award grants or enter into contracts with public and private nonprofit entities to establish an assistance agency in each State and territory and in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This program shall be called the National Diffusion Network and will assist States, local educational agencies, and schools in identifying and securing appropriate, high-quality technical assistance, provide information on and assistance in adopting effective programs and practices, and work cooperatively with the Comprehensive Assistance Centers to improve teaching and learning and raise standards for all students.

"(c) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—To ensure the quality and effectiveness of the comprehensive assistance centers supported under this part, the Secretary shall—

"(1) provide for an external peer review (including representatives of the populations served under this Act) of the centers under this part every 2 years;

"(2) develop, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, the Director of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, and the Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement, a set of performance indicators, for use during the peer reviews required by paragraph (1), that assesses whether the work of the centers assists in improving teaching and learning under this Act for all children, in particular children at risk of educational failure;

"(3) require each center to publish, and disseminate widely throughout its region, an annual report on its services and accomplishments and how those services and accomplishments relate to the performance indicators developed under paragraph (2);

"(4) conduct periodic surveys of users of the centers' services to determine if users are satisfied with the access to and quality of such services;

"(5) collect, as part of the Department's reviews of programs under this Act, information about the availability and quality of services provided by the centers, and share that information with the centers;

"(6) take whatever steps are reasonable and necessary to ensure that each center performs its responsibilities in a satisfactory manner, which may include termination of an award under this part (if the Secretary concludes that performance has been unsatisfactory) and the selection of a new center, as well as whatever interim arrangements the Secretary determines are necessary to ensure the satisfactory delivery of services under this part to the affected region; and

"(7) provide for an independent evaluation of the system of technical assistance centers authorized by this part and report the results of that evaluation to Congress prior to the next reauthorization of this Act.

"(c) **CONTRACT PERIOD.**—Grants or contracts awarded under this section shall be awarded for a period of 5 years following the extension of contracts and grants under section 2206(c).

"SEC. 2344. REQUIREMENTS OF COMPREHENSIVE ASSISTANCE CENTERS."

"Each comprehensive assistance center established under section 2343(a)—

"(1) shall maintain staff expertise in at least all of the following areas:

"(A) Instruction, curriculum improvement, assessment, school reform, and other aspects of title I of this Act.

"(B) Meeting the needs of children served under this Act, including children in high-poverty areas, migratory children, immigrant children, children with limited English proficiency, neglected or delinquent children, homeless children and youth, Indian children, and children with disabilities and where applicable, Alaskan Native children and Native Hawaiian children.

"(C) Professional development for teachers, other school staff, and administrators to help students meet challenging State performance standards.

"(D) Bilingual education, including programs that emphasize English and native language proficiency and promote multicultural understanding.

"(E) Safe and drug-free schools.

"(F) Educational applications of technology.

"(G) Parent involvement and participation.

"(H) The reform of schools and school systems.

"(I) Program evaluation.

"(J) Coordination of services.

"(K) School governance and management.

"(L) Partnerships between the public and private sector, including the formation of partnerships between schools and businesses.

"(2) shall ensure, where appropriate, staff expertise in the special needs of students living in rural areas and in the special needs of local education agencies serving rural areas;

"(3) shall ensure that technical assistance staff have sufficient training, knowledge, and expertise in how to integrate and coordinate programs under this Act with each other, as well as with other Federal, State, and local programs and reforms, and reflect the diverse linguistic and cultural expertise appropriate to the region served;

"(4) shall provide technical assistance using the highest quality and most cost-effective strategies possible;

"(5) shall coordinate services, work cooperatively, and regularly share information with the regional education laboratories, the Eisenhower Regional Math and Science consortia, research and development centers, and other entities engaged in research, development, dissemination, and technical assistance activities which are supported by the Department of Education as part of a Federal technical assistance system, to provide a broad range of support services to schools in the region while minimizing the duplication of such services; and

"(6) shall provide services to States, local educational agencies, tribes, and schools through or in coordination with the State Facilitators of the National Diffusion Network as authorized in section 2343(b) in order to better implement the purposes of this section and provide the support and assistance diffusion agents need to carry out their mission effectively.

"SEC. 2345. DUTIES OF COMPREHENSIVE ASSISTANCE CENTERS."

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Each center established under section 2303(a) shall provide comprehensive, integrated technical assistance services focused on improving teaching and learning.

"(b) **SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE.**—Comprehensive centers shall provide support and assistance to State educational agencies, tribal divisions of education, local educational agencies, schools, and other grant recipients under this Act in—

"(1) the development of plans for integrating programs under this Act with other Federal pro-

grams and with State, local and tribal reform efforts;

"(2) the development, selection, and use of challenging, high-quality curricula aligned with high standards and assessments;

"(3) the identification, adaptation, or development of instructional strategies and materials which meet the needs of children receiving assistance under this Act;

"(4) the development of valid, reliable, and nondiscriminatory systems of assessment which reflect recent advances in the field of education assessment;

"(5) the development, selection, and implementation of effective schoolwide projects;

"(6) improving the capacity of educators, school administrators, counselors, and other school personnel to assist students to reach challenging standards, especially those students furthest from such standards, through the expansion and strengthening of professional development activities;

"(7) expanding and improving opportunities for parents to participate in the education of their children at home and at school;

"(8) creating safe and drug-free environments, especially in areas experiencing high levels of drug use and violence in the community and schools;

"(9) the coordination of services and programs to meet the needs of students so that they can fully participate in the educational program of the school;

"(10) the evaluation of educational programs;

"(11) educational applications of technology, when appropriate, in coordination with the regional mathematics and science education consortia;

"(12) reforming the governance and management of schools; and

"(13) establishing public/private education partnerships, including school/business partnerships.

"(c) **ADDITIONAL DUTIES.**—Additional duties include—

"(1) assisting States, local educational agencies, tribal divisions of education, and schools in replicating and adapting exemplary and promising educational programs, policies, and practices through or in coordination with the National Diffusion Network State Facilitator;

"(2) assisting State educational agencies and local educational agencies to develop school support teams to work with schoolwide programs under title I of this Act; and

"(3) assisting State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and the National Diffusion Network State Facilitators to increase their capacity to provide high-quality technical assistance in support of programs under this Act.

"SEC. 2346. MAINTENANCE OF SERVICE.

"(a) **MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the comprehensive assistance centers funded under this part provide technical assistance services that address the needs of bilingual, migrant, immigrant, and Indian students that are at least comparable to the level of such technical assistance services provided under programs administered by the Secretary prior to the date of the enactment of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994.

"(b) **MINIMUM FUNDS.**—

"(1) **MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.**—In awarding grants or contracts for comprehensive assistance centers, the Secretary shall ensure that the proportion of funds used to provide services that address the needs of limited-English-proficient, immigrant, and migrant students shall be no less than the proportion of funds expended under grants or contracts expiring in fiscal year 1995 for categorical technical assistance centers serving limited-English-proficient and migrant students.

"(2) **INDIAN STUDENTS.**—In awarding grants or contracts for comprehensive assistance centers,

the Secretary shall ensure that the proportion of funds used to provide services that address the need of Indian students through the comprehensive centers established in section 2343(a) shall be no less than the proportion of funds expended under grants or contracts expiring in fiscal year 1995 for technical assistance centers serving Indian students.

"(c) **APPLICATION.**—Applications for funds under subsection (a)(2) shall include how centers will—

"(1) provide expertise in the areas listed in section 2344(l);

"(2) work with the National Diffusion Network authorized in section 2343(b) to conduct outreach to local educational agencies prioritized in section 2348;

"(3) demonstrate support from States and local educational agencies and tribes in the area to be served;

"(4) ensure a fair distribution of services to urban and rural areas;

"(5) utilize technology to provide technical assistance; and

"(6) provide other information the Secretary may require.

In approving applications to comprehensive centers serving Indian students, the Secretary shall give priority to applications from consortia that include Indian educational agencies, organizations, or institutions.

"(d) **TRANSITION.**—The Secretary shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, use funds appropriated under section 2351 to extend or continue existing contracts and grants for categorical technical assistance centers and for National Diffusion Network State Facilitator and Developer Demonstrators through fiscal year 1995 and take other necessary steps to ensure a smooth transition of this part.

"SEC. 2347. STATE-BASED ACTIVITIES.

"(a) **PURPOSES.**—The Secretary shall establish a State-based outreach, dissemination, training, and consultation component of the National Technical Assistance and Dissemination System through the National Diffusion Network and its State Facilitators.

"(b) **IN GENERAL.**—The Department of Education, through the Office of Educational Research and Improvement shall award grants or enter into contracts with public or private nonprofit educational organizations or institutions in each State with demonstrated experience, expertise, and commitment in the areas of applied education research and program dissemination to carry out activities described in subsection (c).

"(c) **NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK STATE FACILITATOR.**—National Diffusion Network State Facilitators shall work in coordination with the comprehensive assistance centers to assist State educational agencies, local educational agencies, tribal divisions of education, and schools to—

"(1) define their technical assistance needs and align them with school reform, professional development, and technology plans;

"(2) secure the technical assistance services that can best fulfill their needs by utilizing Department of Education technical assistance centers, regional education laboratories, Eisenhower Regional consortia, State Literacy Resource Centers, and other technical assistance providers including local providers of professional development services;

"(3) identify educational technology needs and secure the necessary technical assistance to address them;

"(4) prepare for on-site, intensive technical assistance provided by the comprehensive centers, labs, or other service providers;

"(5) utilize technology, including regional and national electronic networks, to increase their access to technical assistance, professional de-

velopment services, and dissemination of exemplary practices and materials;

"(6) deliver high-quality professional development services to their school-based educators; and

"(7) provide organizational development services to facilitate school-based change.

"(d) **ADDITIONAL DUTIES.**—In addition, National Diffusion Network State Facilitators shall—

"(1) disseminate information about school reform and effective and promising practices and help local educational agencies and schools adapt them to their needs;

"(2) facilitate communications between educators to assist the sharing of promising practices and to foster school reform and professional development;

"(3) coordinate their activities with school support teams and distinguished educators in their State;

"(4) coordinate, work cooperatively with, and regularly share information with the comprehensive centers, the Regional Education Laboratories, and other entities engaged in research, development, dissemination, and technical assistance activities which are supported by the Department of Education;

"(5) develop and implement an aggressive outreach plan for reaching the local educational agencies and schools identified as priorities in section 2308; and

"(6) provide technical, dissemination, and support assistance to States, local educational agencies, and schools using the highest quality and most cost-effective methods available.

"(e) **NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK EFFECTIVE PRACTICES.**—The Secretary shall develop a system of validating effective programs and promising practices for dissemination through the National Diffusion Network. Such programs may include exemplary programs funded through any office of the Department of Education, the National Science Foundation, or other Federal agencies. Such a system should be coordinated, aligned with, and administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination. The Secretary shall give priority to identifying, validating, and disseminating effective schoolwide projects, programs addressing the needs of high poverty schools, and programs with the capacity to offer high-quality, sustained technical assistance. The Office of Educational Research and Improvement Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination shall also administer a grants program to such validated Effective Practices for the purpose of dissemination and the provision of technical assistance.

"SEC. 2348. PROGRAM PRIORITIES.

"Both the comprehensive centers and the National Diffusion Network shall give priority service to schoolwide projects, local educational agencies, and Bureau of Indian Affairs schools with the highest percentage or numbers of poor children.

"SEC. 2349. TECHNOLOGY-BASED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

"The Secretary is also authorized to provide a technology-based technical assistance service that will—

"(1) support the administration and implementation of programs authorized by this Act by providing information, including legal and regulatory information, and technical guidance and information about best practices; and

"(2) be accessible to all States, local educational agencies, schools, and others who are recipients of funds under this Act.

"SEC. 2350. ADMINISTRATION.

"The program authorized by this part shall be jointly administered by the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, the Director of Bilingual Education and Minority

Languages Affairs, and the Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement.

"SEC. 2351. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"For the purposes of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated \$70,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999. Of the funds appropriated under this part, not less than \$25,000,000 shall be made available to support activities of the National Diffusion Network authorized in section 2343(b).

"PART E—EDUCATION PROGRAM STRATEGIES

"SEC. 2401. FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

"(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 has been successful in achieving the goals of increasing local flexibility, reducing administrative burden, providing services for private school students, encouraging innovation, and contributing to the improvement of elementary and secondary educational programs.

"(b) **STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.**—It is the purpose of programs under this part:

"(1) To support local education reform efforts which are consistent with and support statewide reform efforts under Goals 2000.

"(2) To support State and local efforts to accomplish the National Education Goals.

"(3) To provide funding to enable State and local educational agencies to implement promising educational reform programs that can be supported by State and local sources of funding after such programs are demonstrated to be effective.

"(4) To provide a continuing source of innovation, educational improvement, and support for library services and instructional materials, including media materials and,

"(5) To meet the special educational needs of at risk and high cost students.

"(c) **STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY.**—The basic responsibility for the administration of funds made available under this part is within the State educational agencies, but it is the intent of Congress that the responsibility be carried out with a minimum of paperwork and that the responsibility for the design and implementation of programs assisted under this part will be mainly that of local educational agencies, school superintendents and principals, and classroom teachers and supporting personnel, because they have the most direct contact with students and are most likely to be able to design programs to meet the educational needs of students in their own districts.

"SEC. 2402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; DURATION OF ASSISTANCE.

"(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—To carry out the purposes of this part, there are authorized to be appropriated \$435,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 and such sums in each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1999.

"(b) **DURATION OF ASSISTANCE.**—During the period beginning October 1, 1994, and ending September 30, 1999, the Secretary shall, in accordance with the provisions of this part, make payments to State educational agencies for the purpose of this section.

"Subpart 1—State and Local Programs

"SEC. 2411. ALLOTMENT TO STATES.

"(a) **RESERVATIONS.**—From the sums appropriated to carry out this subpart in any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve not to exceed 1 percent for payments to Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands, to be allotted in accordance with their respective needs.

"(b) **ALLOTMENT.**—From the remainder of such sums the Secretary shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of the State bears to the school-age population of all States, except that no State shall receive less than an amount equal to one-half of 1 percent of such remainder.

"(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subpart—

"(1) The term 'school-age population' means the population aged 5 through 17.

"(2) The term 'States' includes the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"SEC. 2412. ALLOCATION TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

"(a) **DISTRIBUTION RULE.**—From the sums made available each year to carry out this part, the State educational agency shall distribute not less than 85 percent to local educational agencies within such State according to the relative enrollments in public and private, nonprofit schools within the school districts of such agencies, adjusted, in accordance with criteria approved by the Secretary, to provide higher per pupil allocations to local educational agencies which have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child, such as—

"(1) children living in areas with high concentrations of low-income families,

"(2) children from low-income families, and

"(3) children living in sparsely populated areas.

"(b) **CALCULATION OF ENROLLMENTS.**—(1) The calculation of relative enrollments under subsection (a) shall be on the basis of the total of—

"(A) the number of children enrolled in public schools, and

"(B) the number of children enrolled in private nonprofit schools that desire that their children participate in programs or projects assisted under this part, for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the determination is made. Nothing in this subsection shall diminish the responsibility of local educational agencies to contact, on an annual basis, appropriate officials from private nonprofit schools within the areas served by such agencies in order to determine whether such schools desire that their children participate in programs assisted under this part.

"(2)(A) Relative enrollments under subsection (a) shall be adjusted, in accordance with criteria approved by the Secretary under subparagraph (B), to provide higher per pupil allocations only to local educational agencies which serve the greatest numbers or percentages of—

"(i) children living in areas with high concentrations of low-income families,

"(ii) children from low-income families, or

"(iii) children living in sparsely populated areas.

"(B) The Secretary shall review criteria submitted by a State educational agency for adjusting allocations under paragraph (1) and shall approve such criteria only if the Secretary determines that such criteria are reasonably calculated to produce an adjusted allocation that reflects the relative needs within the State's local educational agencies based on the factors set forth in subparagraph (A).

"(c) **PAYMENT OF ALLOCATIONS.**—

"(1) From the funds paid to it pursuant to section 2402 for a fiscal year, a State educational agency shall distribute to each eligible local educational agency which has submitted an application as required in section 2423 the amount of its allocation as determined under subsection (a).

"(2)(A) Additional funds resulting from higher per pupil allocations provided to a local educational agency on the basis of adjusted enroll-

ments of children described in subsection (a), may, at the discretion of the local educational agency, be allocated for expenditures to provide services for children enrolled in public and private nonprofit schools in direct proportion to the number of children described in subsection (a) and enrolled in such schools within the local educational agency.

"(B) In any fiscal year, any local educational agency that elects to allocate such additional funds in the manner described in subparagraph (A) shall allocate all additional funds to schools within the local educational agency in such manner.

"(C) The provisions of subparagraphs (A) and (B) may not be construed to require any school to limit the use of such additional funds to the provision of services to specific students or categories of students.

"Subpart 2—State Programs

"SEC. 2421. STATE USES OF FUNDS.

"(a) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—A State educational agency may use funds reserved for State use under this section only for—

"(1) State administration of programs under this section including—

"(A) supervision of the allocation of funds to local educational agencies;

"(B) planning, supervision, and processing of State funds; and

"(C) monitoring and evaluation of programs and activities under this part; and

"(2) technical assistance and direct grants to local educational agencies and statewide education reform activities which assist local educational agencies to provide targeted assistance.

"(b) **LIMITATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS.**—Not more than 25 percent of funds available for State programs under this part in any fiscal year may be used for State administration under subsection (a)(1).

"SEC. 2423. STATE APPLICATIONS.

"(a) **APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.**—Any State which desires to receive a grant under this subpart shall submit to the Secretary an application which—

"(1) designates the State educational agency as the State agency responsible for administration and supervision of programs assisted under this part;

"(2)(A) provides for an annual submission of data on the use of funds, the types of services furnished, and the students served under this section; and

"(B) in fiscal year 1998 provides for an evaluation of the effectiveness of programs assisted under this subpart;

"(3) provides that the State educational agency will keep such records and provide such information to the Secretary as may be required for fiscal audit and program evaluation (consistent with the responsibilities of the Secretary under this section);

"(4) provides assurance that, apart from technical and advisory assistance and monitoring compliance with this part, the State educational agency has not exercised and will not exercise any influence in the decision making processes of local educational agencies as to the expenditure made pursuant to an application under section 2433; and

"(5) contain assurances that there is compliance with the specific requirements of this chapter.

"(b) **PERIOD OF APPLICATION.**—An application filed by the State under subsection (a) shall be for a period not to exceed 3 years, and may be amended annually as may be necessary to reflect changes without filing a new application.

"(c) **AUDIT RULE.**—Notwithstanding section 1745 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, local educational agencies receiving less than an average of \$5,000 each under this section need not be audited more frequently than once every 5 years.

"Subpart 3—Local Targeted Assistance Programs"

"SEC. 2431. TARGETED USE OF FUNDS."

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Funds allocated for use under this subpart shall be used by local educational agencies for targeted assistance described in subsection (b).

"(b) TARGETED ASSISTANCE.—The targeted assistance programs referred to in subsection (a) include—

"(1) technology related to the implementation of school-based reform programs, including professional development to assist teachers and other school officials regarding how to use effectively such equipment and software;

"(2) instructional and educational materials, assessments, and library services and materials (including media materials) tied to high academic standards and which are part of an overall education reform program;

"(3) promising education reform projects, including 21st Century Learning Center school projects in accordance with subpart 4; and

"(4) computer hardware and software purchased under this section should be used only for instructional purposes.

"SEC. 2432. ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY."

"In order to conduct the activities authorized by this part, each State or local educational agency may use funds reserved for this part to make grants to and to enter into contracts with local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, libraries, museums, and other public and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions.

"SEC. 2433. LOCAL APPLICATIONS."

"(a) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—A local educational agency or consortia of local educational agencies may receive an allocation of funds under this subpart for any year for which an application is submitted to the State educational agency and such application is certified to meet the requirements of this section. The State educational agency shall certify any such application if such application—

"(1) sets forth the planned allocation of funds among targeted assistance programs described in section 2431 of this part and describes the programs, projects and activities designed to carry out such targeted assistance which it intends to support, together with the reasons for selection of such programs, projects and activities; and

"(2) describes how assistance under this section will contribute to meeting the National Education Goals and improving student achievement or improving the quality of education for students;

"(3) agrees to keep such records, and provide such information to the State educational agency as may reasonably be required for fiscal audit and program evaluation, concession with the responsibilities of the State agency under this part; and

"(4) provides in the allocation of funds for the assistance authorized by this part, and in the design, planning and implementation of such programs, for systematic consultation with parents of children attending elementary and secondary schools in the area served by the local agency, with teachers and administrative personnel in such schools, and with other groups involved in the implementation of this section (such as librarians, school counselors, and other pupil services personnel) as may be considered appropriate by the local educational agency.

"(b) PERIOD OF APPLICATION.—An application filed by a local educational agency under subsection (a) shall be for a period not to exceed 3 fiscal years, may provide for the allocation of funds to programs for a period of 3 years, and may be amended annually as may be necessary to reflect changes without filing a new application.

"(c) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY DISCRETION.—Subject to the limitations and require-

ments of this part, a local educational agency shall have complete discretion in determining how funds under this subpart shall be divided among the areas of targeted assistance. In exercising such discretion, a local educational agency shall ensure that expenditures under this subpart carry out the purposes of this subpart and are used to meet the educational needs within the schools of such local educational agency.

"Subpart 4—21st Century Community Learning Centers"

"SEC. 2441. FINDINGS."

"The Congress finds that—

"(1) there are influences outside of school which affect the ability of a child to achieve academically and schools are in a unique position to identify student and family needs to coordinate programs;

"(2) access to health and social service programs can assist children and their families to improve the ability of the family to take an active role in their child's education;

"(3) coordination of health and social service programs with education can help the Nation meet the National Education Goals and ensure better outcomes for children;

"(4) the high technology, global economy of the 21st century will require lifelong learning to keep America's workforce competitive and successful;

"(5) 21st Century Community Learning Centers enable the entire community to develop an education strategy that addresses the educational needs of all members of local communities; and

"(6) local public schools should provide centers for lifelong learning and educational opportunities for individuals of all ages.

"SEC. 2442. FUNDS FOR COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS."

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Local educational agencies may use funds provided under section 2412 to pay the Federal share of the cost for enabling schools to serve as centers for the delivery of education and human services for members of a community.

"(b) USES OF FUNDS.—Local educational agencies may use funds provided under section 2412 for projects described under this subpart.

"SEC. 2443. PROGRAMS."

"Local educational agencies that receive funds under this subpart may develop programs that include—

"(1) literacy education programs;

"(2) senior citizen programs;

"(3) children's day care services;

"(4) integrated education, health, social service, recreational, or cultural programs;

"(5) summer and weekend school programs in conjunction with summer recreation programs;

"(6) nutrition programs;

"(7) expanded library service hours to serve community needs;

"(8) telecommunications and technology education programs for all ages;

"(9) parenting skills education programs;

"(10) support and training for child day care providers;

"(11) employment counseling, training, and placement;

"(12) services for students who withdraw from school before graduating high school, regardless of age; and

"(13) services for individuals who are either physically or mentally challenged.

"SEC. 2444. REQUIREMENTS."

"A local educational agency that uses funds to develop programs under this subpart shall, at the end of the first year for which funds are used for this purpose, provide information to the State educational agency which describes the activities and projects established with funds under this subpart and includes—

"(1) information on the comprehensive local plan that enables such school to serve as a center for the delivery of education and human services for members of a community; and

"(2) information on the initial evaluation of needs, available resources, and goals and objectives for the proposed community education program and how such evaluation was used to determine the program developed to address such needs; including—

"(A) the mechanism used to disseminate information in a manner understandable and accessible to the community;

"(B) identification of Federal, State, and local programs merged or coordinated so that public resources could be maximized;

"(C) a description of the collaborative efforts of community-based organizations, related public agencies, businesses, or other appropriate organizations;

"(D) a description of how the school will assist as a delivery center for existing and new services; and

"(E) the establishment of the facility utilization policy that specifically states rules and regulations for building and equipment use and supervision guidelines.

"SEC. 2445. DEFINITION."

"For purposes of this subpart, the term 'Community Learning Center' means the provision of educational, recreational, health, and social service programs for residents of all ages of a local community in public school buildings, primarily in rural and inner city areas, operated by the local educational agency in conjunction with local governmental agencies, businesses, vocational education programs, community colleges, universities, cultural, recreational, and other community and human service entities.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RANGEL) having assumed the chair, Mr. VALENTINE, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6) to extend for 6 years the authorizations of appropriations for the programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for certain other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on H.R. 6, the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RANGEL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PLANS FOR CONSIDERATION OF FISCAL YEAR 1995 BUDGET RESOLUTION

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to notify Members about the Rules

Committee's plans for the fiscal year 1995 budget resolution.

The Budget Committee hopes to complete its markup tonight and, allowing 3 days for additional views, will file early next week.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that text will be available at the committee offices tomorrow.

The Rules Committee will meet next week to grant a rule for consideration of the budget resolution.

In order to provide for fair and timely consideration, the committee may grant a rule that structures the offering of amendments.

Any Member contemplating an amendment to the measure should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation by 12 noon on Tuesday, March 8, Mr. Speaker. The committee offices are upstairs in room H-312 in the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make two points about budget amendments. First, Members will find it helpful to work with the Congressional Budget Office as they draft their amendments.

Also, as in the past, the committee looks more favorably on substitutes than on cut-and-bite amendments. Cut-and-bite amendments only raise the same issues that will have to be decided again in the authorization and appropriation process.

We appreciate the cooperation of all Members.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a "Dear Colleague" letter to all offices explaining our intentions on the measure.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1994 TO MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1994

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING GSP BENEFITS TO UKRAINE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am writing to inform you of my intent to add Ukraine to the list of beneficiary developing countries under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). The GSP program offers duty-free access to the U.S. market and is authorized by the Trade Act of 1974.

I have carefully considered the criteria identified in sections 501 and 502 of the Trade Act of 1974. In light of these criteria, and particularly Ukraine's level of development and initiation of economic reforms, I have determined that it is appropriate to extend GSP benefits to Ukraine.

This notice is submitted in accordance with section 502(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 1994.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JAMES NORMAN HALL

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House concurrent resolution to pay a special tribute to one of the outstanding citizens of our country, who was not only a highly decorated war hero but an author who produced classics in American literature—such books as "Mutiny on the Bounty," "Pitcairn's Island," and "Hurricanes."

A native son of the State of Iowa, the late James Norman Hall is highly revered among the island peoples of the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, next month April 22 will commemorate 107 years of James Norman Hall's life. I am especially pleased and honored to have the entire membership of the Iowa delegation to be original cosponsors of this resolution—Mr. SMITH, Mr. LEACH, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. LIGHT-FOOT.

I ask my colleagues to support me for the passage of this resolution in the Congress of the United States.

I want to express my appreciation especially to Mr. and Mrs. Nick Rutgers of Tahiti for their efforts to renovate and establish James Norman Hall's residence in Tahiti as a national historic site for visitors from all over the world to see, and especially for the Polynesian Tahitians whom he loved so much in the remaining years of his life.

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas James Norman Hall, a native son of the State of Iowa born in Colfax in 1887, and a graduate of Grinnell College, was a decorated war hero, noted adventurer, and acclaimed author, who was revered and loved in France and Tahiti, and throughout the South Pacific;

Whereas James Norman Hall exhibited an unwavering commitment to freedom and democracy by volunteering for military service early in World War I and by fighting alongside British forces in the worst of trench warfare, including the Battle of Loos, where he was one of few survivors;

Whereas James Norman Hall continued his fight for liberty by becoming a pilot in the Lafayette Escadrille, an American pursuit squadron of the French Air Service, and his courageous and daring feats in air battles earned him France's highest medals, including the Legion d'Honneur, Medaille Militaire, and Croix de Guerre with 5 Palms;

Whereas James Norman Hall was commissioned as a Captain in the United States Army Air Service when the United States entered World War I, continued his legendary exploits as an ace pilot, acted as wing commander and mentor for then-Lieutenant Eddie Rickenbacker, and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross medal, for gallantry and bravery in battle, by General Pershing;

Whereas James Norman Hall sought serenity after the destructiveness of World War I, moved to the South Pacific in 1920, married a Tahitian woman and lived in Tahiti for over 3 decades, and wrote a prodigious number of articles and books in the library of his home in Arue, Tahiti;

Whereas much of James Norman Hall's writing enriched the world's understanding of Tahiti and the South Pacific;

Whereas James Norman Hall coauthored, with Charles Nordhoff, classic masterpieces that have come to epitomize the tropics, including "Mutiny on the Bounty", "Pitcairn's Island", and "Hurricanes";

Whereas, despite James Norman Hall's achievements as a decorated war hero and famed literary figure, he remained to his death a humble, self-effacing man who endeared himself to the people of Tahiti with his keen sense of generosity, kindness, and real concern for others, prompting James Michener to state that James Norman Hall was "the most loved American who ever came to the tropics" and that when "he died, on every island in the Pacific where even no man could read, there was sorrow"; and

Whereas the home and library of James Normal Hall, in Arue, Tahiti, are being restored as a museum to honor this son of the State of Iowa and hero of the United States, England, France, and French Polynesia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) honors James Norman Hall and recognizes his outstanding contributions to the United States, France, Tahiti, and the South Pacific, including his extraordinary service rendered in wartime for the defense of freedom, his outstanding achievements in the literary field, and his lifework that has enriched the world's understanding of the people of the South Pacific; and

(2) requests the President of the United States to provide for the presentation of a copy of this concurrent resolution by appropriate officials of the United States Government to the President of Tahiti Nui (French Polynesia), so that it may be publicly displayed at the James Norman Hall Museum in Tahiti, where it will express the appreciation of the people and government of the United States for the contributions of James Norman Hall and will show recognition of the achievements of this great son of the State of Iowa.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, later this month, the House will debate and vote on a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. I have long supported a balanced budget amendment, because I believe that, unless we control the deficit, our Nation will soon face a fiscal crisis of unimaginable proportions.

The Clinton administration has recently been crowing because the deficit will be only \$171 billion next year. But as this chart shows, any benefit we gained from the Clinton tax increase will be very short-lived. Within only a few years, the deficit will pass its current level, and skyrocket on to new record highs.

Well, those annual deficits mount year after year, adding to the public debt—which is simply all the deficits over the years added together. As everybody knows, if you borrow money, you have to pay interest. And the more you borrow, the more substantial the interest burden becomes.

This chart illustrates just how vicious that cycle has become for our Federal Government. In 1970, about 16 cents of every dollar of personal income taxes went to servicing the national debt. Today, 40 cents out of every income tax dollar goes solely to pay interest on that debt. Every year

that we run a budget deficit, the debt will continue to grow. And, as the debt itself continues to expand, interest charges servicing it will inevitably swallow the Federal budget.

If we want to stop this fiscal insanity, there are many hard choices to be made, and passing a balanced budget amendment is only the first step. We still need to make the tough spending choices to actually balance the budget.

Many Members of Congress and outside groups have advanced partial and comprehensive plans to reduce the deficit. Some simply call for across-the-board spending reductions and set lower spending caps, without spelling out the policy changes necessary to achieve those lower caps. A few have made wish lists of preferred spending cuts, but then leave it at that.

What no one, in or out of Congress, has ever done before is conduct a comprehensive survey of all those specific spending cut ideas, find those that are workable, and then draft them into a legislative package that actually approaches achieving a balanced budget.

I am proud to announce today that Congressman TIM PENNY and I have done just that. We have just introduced an actual bill that lays out, program-by-program, line-by-line, how to all but eliminate the deficit. The Fiscal Responsibility Act, the product of nearly a year's work, contains over 150 specific, narrowly defined, spending cuts. This legislation will reduce the deficit by over \$550 billion over the next 5 years—without raising taxes.

Mr. Speaker, no one is spared in this package—from agricultural subsidies, to transportation, to defense, to Congress and, yes, even sensitive entitlement programs and COLA's. Everybody is asked to sacrifice a little today to avoid the inevitable need to inflict much more severe financial pain tomorrow if we do not solve this crisis.

I am the first to say that there are, indeed, many hard choices in this package. Faced with an up or down vote on many of the specific provisions, Congressman PENNY and I might very well oppose them. But, as a package, the Fiscal Responsibility Act is a true deficit solution, fairly and honestly achieved. I encourage my colleagues to take the first step toward a balanced budget by cosponsoring the Fiscal Responsibility Act.

□ 1740

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Penny].

Mr. PENNY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Colorado for his work in developing this package of spending cuts. As he just described, this proposal represents 550 billion dollar's worth of spending reductions over the next 5 years. That gets us much the way toward a balanced budget, and that cer-

tainly ought to be our goal here as national policymakers.

I also want to agree with his observation that in order to come up with the spending cuts required to balance this budget, we all have to swallow hard because there is no easy package.

In this instance, there are individual items in this package that may not be terribly popular in Colorado or in Minnesota, but we have to challenge our constituents to look at the larger needs, reducing the deficit by \$550 billion, even though it includes some sacrifice on the part of the constituents of the gentleman from Colorado and on the part of my constituents in Minnesota, that is what we have to be willing to endorse if we want to ultimately solve this problem.

We discovered that last fall as we developed the Penny-Kasich spending reduction plan, including \$90 billion in spending cuts over a 5-year period. That package of cuts might have been hard for Members to vote for if they had to cast a vote individually on the 90 separate cuts within that package. But by putting it together, people could say, "Most of these cuts are required. I am willing to swallow hard on the few that hurt my own back yard." That is the way you have to solve this problem, and that is what we tried to demonstrate with this plan, and we urge our colleagues to cosponsor this effort.

Mr. SCHAEFER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

WASTE EXPORT AND IMPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RANGEL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. SYNAR, in introducing today the Waste Export and Import Control Act of 1994. On March 22, 1989, the United States joined with 103 other concerned nations to sign the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal. The signatory nations recognized the need for an international agreement addressing the risks to health and the environment posed by the improper management of exported wastes. Since that time, still more nations have added their names to the list of signatories, and over 60 nations have become full voting parties to the convention.

In the 102d Congress, the Senate voted favorably to give its advice and consent to ratification. With a positive policy toward the environment from this administration, we are now ready to pass implementing legislation. Implementing legislation will allow us to become a full voting party. We remain one of the world's leading exporters of wastes; we should be a leader in ensuring that those wastes are managed properly.

The Waste Export and Import Control Act of 1994 addresses both of these concerns. First,

it provides the Environmental Protection Agency with the needed authority to implement the Basel Convention. Second, and more significantly, it demonstrates to the world that America takes responsibility for the proper management of the wastes we export.

This legislation bans waste trade between the United States and other nations absent a bilateral or multilateral agreement governing this trade. Further, the bill establishes a set of criteria by which the Environmental Protection Agency will make a finding that the party to receive an exported waste can handle the waste in an environmentally sound manner.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the product of consultations over the last 3 years with stakeholders from industry, the environmental community, and representatives of other interested nations. It is my firm belief that the objectives of this legislation are shared by the administration, and I look forward to working with the administration to resolve differences of approach. Toward that end, I wish to thank my colleague, MIKE SYNAR, for his tireless efforts on this issue and to ask him to continue the very productive relationship we have shared in the past.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join Congressman SYNAR and Congressman SWIFT in introducing the Waste Export and Import Control Act of 1994. The United States joined with over 100 nations in signing the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal nearly 4 years ago. U.S. implementation of this agreement is long overdue and will allow us to join with over 60 other nations in becoming full voting parties to the convention.

Mr. Speaker, I joined with Congressmen SYNAR, CONYERS, and Wolpe in introducing similar legislation over 3 years ago. This bill goes even further in ensuring that illegal and dangerous shipments of hazardous and non-hazardous waste across national borders will come to an end. Specifically, our bill calls for an immediate ban on the export of waste except where a bilateral or multilateral agreement governing waste trade between the countries exists. In order to enter into such an agreement, the Environmental Protection Agency must find that the importing country or countries have the capacity and enforcement mechanisms to handle the waste in the most environmentally sound manner. Currently, the United States has bilateral agreements for waste exports for disposal with Canada, and on waste exports for recycling with Mexico and the OECD nations.

The bill also calls for joint inspections of receiving facilities in cases where the EPA Administrator suspects that U.S. waste is being handled in a way that threatens public health or the environment. Furthermore, under this legislation, the EPA is authorized to halt or recall shipments from facilities that the EPA believes are unable to handle U.S. waste properly.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has recently released its set of principles for implementing the Basel Convention. There are a few minor differences between our proposals, but I am hopeful that this bill will serve as a starting point on reaching consensus on this important issue. Our objectives are the same—to mini-

mize the export of waste and to ensure that all waste is treated in a way that protects human health and the environment.

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join with my good friend and colleague, Representative AL SWIFT, to introduce the Waste Export and Import Control Act of 1994. Passage of this bill will enable the United States to eliminate exports of hazardous and nonhazardous waste to nations unable to manage the waste in an environmentally sound manner and will finally allow the United States to ratify the Basel Convention on the Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, which we signed in 1989.

I first became involved with this issue in 1988, when the Subcommittee on Environment, Energy and Natural Resources, which I chair, held oversight hearings on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's efforts to monitor and control hazardous waste exports.

Although current U.S. law requires EPA to obtain the prior informed consent of the nation receiving the waste, we were appalled to find out that under the law EPA could not refuse to allow waste shipments in cases where the Agency knew or suspected that the waste would not be handled properly. The hearings also revealed an exponential increase since 1980 in the number of export proposals to EPA from companies wishing to export hazardous waste to developing nations with lax or nonexistent environmental regulations or to nations that clearly were unable to manage the waste in an environmentally sound manner. EPA attributed this increase to simple economics. As domestic waste disposal choices in the United States became more limited and costly, some companies found it cheaper and easier to export their waste to foreign countries, often countries with shoddy environmental practices.

Finally, we discovered that U.S. law applies only to hazardous waste, and that other so-called nonhazardous waste was left entirely unregulated. Failure to regulate these non-hazardous wastes led to embarrassing international incidents where U.S. barges filled with municipal garbage and incinerator ash traveled from port to port in search of a dumping ground. While private companies were the ones to initiate these shipments, the United States received the black eye and suffered the international stigma of trying to pass off our waste problems onto poor underdeveloped nations.

In 1989, the United States and 115 other nations participated in and signed the U.N.-sponsored Basel Convention on the Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal. The Basel Convention established an international framework for regulating waste trade. Its goals are threefold: First, to ensure that party nations work to prevent pollution before it is generated wherever possible; second, to encourage party nations to manage and dispose of their own wastes to the maximum extent possible; and third, to ensure that any waste that is exported to foreign nations is treated in an environmentally sound manner.

The Convention entered into effect on May 5, 1992, following ratification by 20 nations. Currently, 54 nations have ratified the Conven-

tion. Regrettably, the United States has not yet ratified the Convention because implementing legislation has not been passed.

In May 1989, I introduced, along with Congressmen Howard Wolpe, JOHN PORTER, and JOHN CONYERS, the Waste Export Control Act. That legislation allowed exports only to foreign facilities that would treat the waste in a manner no less strict than would be required in the United States. The legislation spelled out basic requirements that EPA should look for in determining whether a facility treated waste in a manner no less strict than is required by the United States.

I believed then, as I believe now, that there are probably situations where it is cheaper and where it makes more sense to export waste than to find a place to dispose of waste domestically. In addition, as a strong supporter of free trade, I did not believe that an outright ban on exports was appropriate for facilities in countries that could show that they could meet or beat U.S. standards. Others didn't exactly share my views. At one end of the spectrum our legislation was criticized by Greenpeace as being too conservative—they wanted a total ban. At the other end of the spectrum, the Bush administration's EPA and State Department criticized the bill as too liberal.

Over the past 2 years, I have been working closely with Representative SWIFT, chairman of the Transportation and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee, to address this important issue. We have crafted what I believe is a strong piece of legislation. Our bill would ban all exports of hazardous waste except to those countries where a bilateral or multilateral agreement exists to ensure proper handling and environmentally sound disposal of such wastes. The United States currently has bilateral agreements on waste exports for disposal with Canada, and on waste exports for recycling purposes with Mexico and the OECD nations.

The bill sets up high hurdles that nations must meet under the bilateral or multilateral agreements. For example, the bill requires that, prior to entering into a bilateral agreement with a receiving nation, EPA make a finding that the receiving country has enacted, and can reasonably be expected to maintain and enforce, a strong environmental regulatory program.

The bill also provides for joint inspections of receiving facilities in cases where the Administrator suspects that U.S. waste is not being managed properly. The bill also authorizes EPA to halt shipments to or recall shipments from facilities that EPA believes would handle the U.S. waste improperly.

I believe this implementing legislation will eliminate unsound waste export proposals and will enhance the protection of human health and the environment globally. All countries are treated equally under this legislation—we do not distinguish between developing countries and industrialized countries. However, as has been the case from the beginning, we support banning waste exports to nations which ban waste imports. Most importantly for swift U.S. ratification of the Convention, we believe this bill can achieve political consensus relatively quickly.

The Clinton administration has just announced its own set of principles for Basel

legislation, which takes a slightly different approach in restricting waste exports. President Clinton would like to see a ban on waste exports except to North America, and would phase out exports for recyclable wastes to OECD countries over the next 5 years. The administration's principles also provide for exceptions and re-openers, which would allow exports despite the ban in instances where an economically and environmentally superior disposal or treatment technology is available in a foreign nation.

I want to make one thing perfectly clear: We all share a common goal of minimizing waste exports, and of ensuring that any U.S. waste that is exported is managed properly in the receiving country. The bill Chairman SWIFT and I introduce today is a good starting point that will, hopefully, facilitate fruitful discussions on how best to address this issue. I look forward to working with the administration, other Members of Congress, environmental groups and industry to achieve speedy action on Basel implementing legislation.

REVOLVING DOOR JUSTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS] is recognized for 45 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Judge Kenneth Kilpatrick, a superior court judge from Jonesboro, GA. Judge Kilpatrick recently shared with me a packet which he sent to Georgia Governor Zell Miller. These materials are a testament to the challenges and frustrations facing our Nation's judges as they attempt to carry out their work.

The most frustrating thing that good judges like Mr. Kilpatrick face is the ridiculous practice by parole boards of paroling convicted criminals early. Judge Kilpatrick has no political agenda, he simply is asking Federal, State, and local officials to support him in his efforts to keep criminals behind bars and require them to serve their sentences.

We have criminals in Georgia getting out of the penitentiary before they have served one-third of their sentence. Is it any wonder that the American people are concerned about crime?

Our prison system is more of a rest stop for a lot of criminals—it gives them a little time to rest and relax while they plan for future crimes and gain insights from their fellow inmates.

We need to go back to the days when going to the penitentiary meant you served hard time and repaid society for your crimes.

We must ensure that criminals serve their sentences. Many Americans consider the criminal justice system a joke because early paroles make our judges appear as if they do not mean what they say. The people have no confidence in a system that says a criminal

is sentenced to 20 years in prison but requires him to serve only 2.

Currently, Judge Kilpatrick is leading a charge by superior court judges in the State of Georgia to encourage the State Board of Pardons and Paroles to stop the practice of early release of convicted criminals.

It is utterly outrageous for Members of Congress and the President to talk tough about crime while pardon and parole boards are allowing criminals to serve minimal portions of their sentences. Not only do early pardons and paroles endanger law-abiding citizens, they also demoralize the brave men and women of law enforcement and diligent judges who deliver appropriate sentences.

Part of the problem is the lack of prison space, and I believe the Federal Government should assist States and localities in the construction of new penitentiaries without burdensome Federal mandates attached.

Judge Kilpatrick cited 40 examples of convicted Georgia criminals he sentenced who were subsequently released early by the pardons and paroles boards. I will highlight a few of these criminals:

John Michael Conn: Convicted of vehicular homicide in the first degree on July 25, 1991. He was drunk—.16—when he hit and killed a 13-year-old boy riding his bike on Thomas Road in Clayton County. He received a split sentence totaling 15 years—serve 8 years and 7 years probation. Mr. Conn was paroled on December 9, 1993, after serving less than 18 months of his sentence. This was only 13.7 percent of the 8-year penitentiary sentence he received.

John Fredrick Freeman: Convicted of possession with the intent to distribute cocaine on September 29, 1992. The pardons and paroles board says that Mr. Freeman will be released in March 1994 after serving 18 months of his 10-year sentence. This will be only 15 percent of his 10-year sentence.

Shane Dolan Knight: Convicted of at least 18 counts of burglary and forgery in the first degree. He was given a sentence of 10 years, but the pardons and paroles board says that Mr. Knight will be released in December 1994 after serving only 22 months, or 18 percent of his 10-year sentence.

Karlston R. Blackstock: Convicted of three counts of burglary, he was sentenced to 15 years. The pardons and paroles board says that he will be released in September 1996 after serving only 48 months of his sentence. This is less than 27 percent of his sentence.

In many States this has become an epidemic and recent polls show that there are few matters which rate as a higher public concern than the revolving door criminal justice system.

Law-abiding citizens are losing faith in the justice system's ability to exact penalties for crimes and protect them from victimization.

Dedicated judges and police officers are frustrated by the fact that their arrests and convictions are overturned by pardons and paroles boards.

Criminals—I repeat—criminals know the criminal justice system better than anyone, and you can be sure they are pleased with the way the justice system is working today. Sometimes I wonder if we have some program that allows criminals to design their pardon and parole policies—I doubt they could have created more lenient policies.

Recent polls show that the No. 1 issue in the minds of most Americans is crime. It ranks ahead of health care, welfare reform, even economic issues.

A recent Newsweek-Child Defense Fund poll shows that the threat of violent crime was the No. 1 concern among parents and children alike. This issue has garnered the interest of the American public, State legislatures, including the Georgia State Legislature, the media, and Congress. Working together, we can begin to address violent crime.

Let's look at the FBI statistics. They report that violent crimes went from 161 per 100,000 persons in 1960 to 758 per 100,000 in 1992. This is 371-percent increase.

The fear of many Americans is justified because all you have to do is read the newspaper to know the reality of escalating crime in the United States. We can no longer take for granted the basic ideas of safety and security within our own communities.

There are three things the Federal Government needs to do to help States fight crime.

First, the Federal Government should provide assistance for the construction of State and local prisons. The amount of funds allocated to each State should be based on need as shown through early pardons and paroles and percentage of prison overcrowding.

Some Members of Congress want to tie prison construction money to a set of initiatives that States must adopt in order to receive funds. These are what I refer to as blackmail provisions—do what I say and I will give you money.

Many of these initiatives could create expensive unfunded mandates on States, and even more importantly they will create a costly delay in the construction of new penitentiaries. These delays come from waiting for legislatures to act on blackmail requirements.

It is time for Congress to stop grandstanding and trying to push States around. We need to help States keep criminals off the streets. Our State Governors and legislators are at the ground level and they see the effects of crime every day. Let's give them support instead of redtape.

We cannot afford to wait—the crime problem must be addressed immediately. In Georgia we have tough laws on the books. We should enforce the

laws that already exist. What Georgia needs is money for new prison space, not Federal legislative dictates.

The best way to fund these prisons would be to transfer money being used for construction of new Federal prisons. In Georgia our prisons have been overcrowded at approximately 104 percent of capacity.

In 1988 Georgia initiated one of the most aggressive prison construction programs in the Nation building 11 new facilities which provided approximately 15,000 new bed spaces.

According to Georgia Department of Corrections projections—Georgia will be out of bed space by 1996. Georgia will have 32,946 inmate beds by the end of fiscal year 1996. The prison population in 1996 is projected to be 35,932 persons. By the year 2003 the population will more than double to a size of 52,976 persons.

Clearly the States need help in the construction of new prison space. If they don't have prison space they will be forced to release convicts early to make room.

Only around 5 percent of all crimes are Federal crimes and prison funds could be better spent at the State level. Instead of federalizing more crimes, we should help States keep more of their prisoners behind bars.

Second, we should limit Federal appeals on death penalty cases to one. We must eliminate the unjust and costly delay in imposition of death penalties. The endless appeals now allowed in death penalty cases have virtually caused capital punishment to become obsolete.

And the costs associated with these endless appeals are unbelievable. A limit on habeas corpus appeals would allow a quicker imposition of sentences and a reduction in costs being passed on to taxpayers.

The third way the Federal Government can help is by making changes in the juvenile justice system to allow for information sharing between agencies on a juvenile's prior criminal record.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention reported that arrests for violent crimes by juveniles increased 91 percent between 1970 and 1992. They also report that between 1987 and 1991, the number of violent crime arrests of juveniles increased by 50 percent—double the increase in arrests of those 18 and older.

Young people are committing more crimes. In 1991, juveniles accounted for 17 percent of all violent crime arrests.

The young are more often the target of crime as well. The Federal Bureau of Investigation says that children under 18 are 244 percent more likely to be killed than they were in 1986.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention records show that between 1985 and 1988, 67 out of 1,000 teenagers were victims of violent crime compared with 26 out of 1,000 persons age 20 or older.

And the Washington Post, recently reported that violence took the lives of 2,428 children in 1992, an increase of 67 percent in just 6 years.

The statistics are alarming, and the continued increase in juvenile crime shows something must be done to stem this tide. And the increase in juvenile criminals is clogging the juvenile courts as well as increasing the number of young people in prisons.

If agencies are allowed to share information on young people who are in danger of becoming delinquents we may be able to reach them and avoid them becoming another adult criminal.

There has been a lot of tough talk coming from President Clinton and Congress on the issue of crime. It is time for action.

As we take action on crime, we must avoid having the Federal Government step in where State and local governments have constitutional authority. The Federal Government must support States in their efforts to keep violent criminals off the streets not usurp them.

We do not need a new litany of Federal mandates on States or the creation of a longer list of Federal crimes.

We should help States with the money they need to construct prisons as long as States provide funding for prison operations, limit the appeals process and allow agencies to share information on juveniles who commit crimes.

Working together we can reduce crime, get criminals off the streets and keep them behind bars.

The law abiding citizens of this country deserve to be protected from convicted criminals.

The dedicated judges who provide just sentences deserve our support.

And the dedicated law enforcement officers who risk their lives to arrest criminals deserve the assurance that criminals will serve their sentences.

I want to thank Judge Kenneth Kilpatrick and the judges like him throughout Georgia and across this Nation who are trying to improve the criminal justice system. Congress should focus on substance not politics and do our part to keep criminals off our streets.

The people have heard enough rhetoric—it is time for action. Let's shut the door on early paroles once and for all.

In closing, I want to refer to the pledge we so graciously render to our flag and Nation.

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands—

The Republic for which it stands. The people. The people make up the Republic. Our pledge is to the people. We as Members of Congress make this pledge every day as we convene this House.

one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Yes, "under God," we have united as a nation. We have been granted a Government which allows us to protect our liberty and render justice to all.

We as a nation protect our liberty through faith, patriotism, and a strong defense. We as a nation are often called upon to protect our nations' liberty because of our faith and strength. Why? Because aggressors of liberty are fearful of our strength and respect our values.

However, our most threatening aggressor walks among us, dividing us from within—the criminal. Yes, the criminal is the aggressor we fear most today.

"Justice for all." We must make the criminal as fearful of us as any aggressor we have faced or will face. Only justice will render such fear to the criminal aggressor.

We as dutiful officers of this republic must harness the criminal element which is threatening our liberty from within our own boundaries. Justice will only prevail when we as a Congress swallow our thirst for power here in Washington and assist our local and State governments in stopping the criminal threat to our liberty.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 3 p.m., on account of personal business.

Mr. MCDADE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHAEFER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCHAEFER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DARDEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SWIFT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHAEFER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HORN in two instances.

Mr. PETRI.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
Mr. BEREUTER in two instances.
Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. QUILLEN.
Mr. WALSH.
Mr. COBLE.
Ms. MOLINARI.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DARDEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FROST.
Mr. DIXON.
Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. BLACKWELL.
Mr. COSTELLO.
Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi in three instances.

Mr. MEEHAN.
Ms. KAPTUR.
Mr. CARDIN.
Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. PICKLE.
Mr. FOGLIETTA.
Mr. DURBIN.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.
Mr. TORRES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MENENDEZ.
Mr. WYNN.
Mr. KILDEE in three instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1789. An act to amend title 23, United States Code, to permit the use of funds under the highway bridge replacement and rehabilitation program for seismic retrofit of bridges, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 7, 1994, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2695. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Federal Crop Insurance Reform Act of 1994"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2696. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-204, "Board of Education of the Baltimore Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church, Inc., Equitable

Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2697. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-205, "Financial Administration Revision and Clarification Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2698. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2699. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2700. A letter from the Chair, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2701. A letter from the Acting Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAMBERT (for herself, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 3947. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to treat certain clinics operated by children's hospitals as federally qualified health centers under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 3948. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BATEMAN:

H.R. 3949. A bill entitled "The Firefighter and Rescue Squad Worker Act"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TUCKER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 3950. A bill to provide grants to local entities to improve the academic performance and social development of at-risk children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. GRANDY, Mr.

HOAGLAND, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. CANADY, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. FIELDS of Texas):

H.R. 3951. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the reclassification of certain dues paid to tax-exempt agricultural or horticultural organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 3952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to alleviate the inequitable tax treatment of individuals operating small, expanding publishing businesses as S corporations or partnerships, thereby encouraging the growth and development of such businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTTO:

H.R. 3953. A bill to authorize Escambia County, FL, to convey certain lands in Florida to a political subdivision of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 3954. A bill to expand the Mni Wiconi rural water supply project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROWLAND (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ZELIFF, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ORTON, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 3955. A bill to increase the availability and continuity of health coverage for employees and their families, to prevent fraud and abuse in the health care delivery system, to reform medical malpractice liability standards, to reduce paperwork and simplify administration of health care claims, to promote preventive care, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LINDER, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. GINGRICH):

H.R. 3956. A bill to establish the Freedom National Park in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin):

H.R. 3957. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reserve a portion of the funds made available for capitalization grants for water pollution control revolving funds for the purpose of making grants to States that set aside amounts of State funds for water pollution control in excess of the amounts required under such act,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHAEFER (for himself and Mr. PENNY):

H.R. 3958. A bill to reduce the budget deficit of the United States, and for other purposes; jointly, to the committees on Agriculture, Armed Services, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, Government Operations, House Administration, the Judiciary, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Natural Resources, Post Office and Civil Service, Public Works and Transportation, Rules, Science, Space, and Technology, Small Business, Veterans' Affairs, Ways and Means, and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H.R. 3959. A bill to extend the effectiveness of an exemption from the requirements of the Depository Institution Management Interlocks Act; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. SCOTT, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 3960. A bill to provide for health care for every American and to control the cost and enhance the quality of the health care system; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Armed Services, Post Office and Civil Service, Natural Resources, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H.R. 3961. A bill to amend the Act known as the Miller Act to raise the value of contracts for which performance bonds and payment bonds are required under that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3962. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Energy to undertake initiatives to address certain needs in the Lower Mississippi Delta Region, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself and Mr. GINGRICH):

H.J. Res. 329. Joint resolution designating March 23, 1994, as "Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A."; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.J. Res. 330. Joint resolution designating May 1994 as "National Community Residential Care Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 214. Concurrent resolution urging the President to promote political stability in Tajikistan through efforts to encourage political resolution of the conflict and respect for human rights and through the provision of humanitarian assistance and (subject to certain conditions) economic assistance to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. LEACH, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. LIGHT-FOOT):

H. Con. Res. 215. Concurrent resolution honoring James Norman Hall and recognizing his outstanding contributions to the United States and the South Pacific; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOSS (for himself and Mr. HYDE):

H. Res. 378. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require Members to sign an oath of secrecy before receiving access to classified information; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 173: Mr. DELAY.
H.R. 291: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SWETT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 300: Mr. BORSKI and Mr. CALLAHAN.
H.R. 411: Mr. EMERSON.
H.R. 417: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. BEREUTER.
H.R. 427: Mr. SLATTERY.
H.R. 479: Mr. HAMBURG.
H.R. 630: Mr. FROST, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 799: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.
H.R. 840: Mr. MOAKLEY.
H.R. 886: Mr. ROGERS.
H.R. 1155: Mr. ROSE and Mr. EMERSON.
H.R. 1164: Ms. SHEPHERD.
H.R. 1171: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 1176: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 1349: Mr. EWING.
H.R. 1490: Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. KIM, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 1718: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. MANZULLO, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1719: Mr. DELAY.
H.R. 1736: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. GINGRICH.
H.R. 1801: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1883: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. THOMPSON.
H.R. 1886: Mr. BLACKWELL.
H.R. 1897: Mr. LOWEY and Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana.
H.R. 1928: Mr. WELDON.
H.R. 1980: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 2292: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. EVANS, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 2340: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2355: Mr. HOKE.
H.R. 2396: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2443: Ms. LAMBERT and Mr. PORTMAN.
H.R. 2460: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama and Ms. LONG.
H.R. 2467: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KING, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 2474: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 2580: Mr. FOGLETTA.
H.R. 2767: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. EWING, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KING, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2803: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.
H.R. 2937: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 3023: Mr. KYL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BUCHER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 3064: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 3182: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.
H.R. 3203: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, and Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 3213: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 3231: Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 3235: Mr. KLEIN.

H.R. 3246: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DICKS, Ms. LAMBERT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. LIGHT-FOOT, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. INSLEE, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3261: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TALENT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 3293: Ms. FURSE and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 3367: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 3392: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. MCCANDLESS.

H.R. 3434: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 3472: Mr. FROST, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KLICK, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 3513: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 3523: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. LINDER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 3527: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 3538: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PENNY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. OLVER, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. STARK, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 3546: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 3573: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. PARKER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. ORTON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 3584: Ms. LOWEY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. POMBO, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 3614: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. VISCOSKY.

H.R. 3636: Mr. LAZIO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. KING, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 3642: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HOKE, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LEVY, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 3720: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3787: Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 3797: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 3808: Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 3810: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 3840: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WILSON, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. FROST, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 3862: Mr. CRANE and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 3866: Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.R. 3875: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 3878: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 3912: Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 3925: Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. WATT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. BISHOP.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming and Mr. HUFFINGTON.

H.J. Res. 113: Mr. GEKAS.

H.J. Res. 209: Ms. ESHOO.

H.J. Res. 286: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SABO, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WALSH.

H.J. Res. 297: Mr. BEVILL.

H.J. Res. 302: Mr. WISE, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CARR, Mr. STARK, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. SABO, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.J. Res. 304: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 305: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.J. Res. 310: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. DORNAN.

H.J. Res. 314: Mr. MCDADE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. FROST.

H.J. Res. 318: Mr. FROST, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. MCHALE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. SWETT, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. VOLKMER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TUCKER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HAMBURG, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. BREWSTER, and Ms. DANNER.

H. Con. Res. 166: Mr. BOEHLERT and Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 179: Mr. ARCHER and Mr. MCNULTY.

H. Con. Res. 184: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. EWING, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H. Res. 38: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H. Res. 236: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WATT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KLEIN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. LEVY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PICKLE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. GORDON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H. Res. 365: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. GILCHREST.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 9 by Mr. WELDON on House Resolution 227: William H. Zeff, Jr.

Petition 10 by Mr. MCCOLLUM on House Resolution 295: Curt Weldon and Christopher Cox.

Petition 11 by Mr. RAMSTAD on House Resolution 247: Bill McCollum, Bill Barrett, Peter G. Torkildsen, Jim Bunning, Amo Houghton, Charles T. Canady, Wayne Allard, Michael Huffington, Vernon J. Ehlers, Henry Bonilla, Wally Herger, Pat Roberts, Tillie K. Fowler, John M. McHugh, Jay Kim, Peter T. King, Jennifer Dunn, Curt Weldon, W.J. (Billy) Tauzin, Joe Knollenberg, William H. Zeff, Jr., James V. Hansen, Dan Burton, Thomas J. Ridge, Henry J. Hyde, Jon Kyl, James H. (Jimmy) Quillen, Deborah Pryce, E. Clay Shaw, Jr., David L. Hobson, Christopher Cox, Gary A. Franks, Jim Kolbe, Jim Saxton, Dan Miller, and James A. Traficant, Jr.

Petition 12 by Mr. TRAFICANT on H.R. 3261: Christopher Cox, Douglas Applegate, Stephen Horn, and Jim Ramstad.

Petition 13 by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey on House Resolution 281: Bill McCollum, Jack Quinn, Ralph M. Hall, Lamar S. Smith, Joel Hefley, Peter G. Torkildsen, Thomas W. Ewing, Mike Parker, Jim Bunning, Jan Meyers, James C. Greenwood, Michael Huffington, Tim Holden, Collin C. Peterson, Henry Bonilla, Pat Roberts, John M. McHugh, Peter T. King, Jennifer Dunn, Curt Weldon, Charles W. Stenholm, Thomas J. Ridge, Joe Barton, Dan Burton, James V. Hansen, Henry J. Hyde, Jon Kyl, James H. (Jimmy) Quillen, Joe Skeen, Deborah Pryce, E. Clay Shaw, Jr., Gary A. Franks, Bill Paxon, Christopher Cox, Gerald Soimom, Sherwood L. Boehlert, Stephen Horn, Dan Miller, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Robert H. Michel, John L. Mica, and Earl Hutto.